arXiv:1202.4876v4 [math.AP] 21 Apr 2012

OBSERVABILITY INEQUALITIES AND MEASURABLE SETS

J. APRAIZ, L. ESCAURIAZA, G. WANG, AND C. ZHANG

Abstract. This paper presents two observability inequalities for the heat equation over $\Omega \times (0,T)$. In the first one, the observation is from a subset of positive measure in $\Omega \times (0,T)$, while in the second, the observation is from a subset of positive surface measure on $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$. It also proves the Lebeau-Robbiano spectral inequality when Ω is a bounded Lipschitz and locally star-shaped domain. Some applications for the above-mentioned observability inequalities are provided.

1. Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and T be a fixed positive time. Consider the heat equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ u(0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

with u_0 in $L^2(\Omega)$. The solution of (1.1) will be treated as either a function from $[0,T]$ to $L^2(\Omega)$ or a function of two variables x and t. Two important apriori estimates for the above equation are as follows:

$$\|u(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N(\Omega,T,\mathcal{D}) \int_{\mathcal{D}} |u(x,t)|\, dxdt, \quad \text{for all } u_0 \in L^2(\Omega), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is a subset of $\Omega \times (0,T)$, and

$$\|u(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N(\Omega,T,\mathcal{J}) \int_{\mathcal{J}} |\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu} u(x,t)|\, d\sigma dt, \quad \text{for all } u_0 \in L^2(\Omega), \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is a subset of $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$. Such apriori estimates are called observability inequalities.

In the case that $\mathcal{D} = \omega \times (0,T)$ and $\mathcal{J} = \Gamma \times (0,T)$ with ω and Γ accordingly open and nonempty subsets of Ω and $\partial\Omega$, both inequalities (1.2) and (1.3) (where $\partial\Omega$ is smooth) were essentially first established, via the Lebeau-Robbiano spectral inequalities in [28] (See also [29, 34, 16]). These two estimates were set up to the linear parabolic equations (where $\partial\Omega$ is of class C^2), based on the Carleman inequality provided in [18]. In the case when $\mathcal{D} = \omega \times (0,T)$ and $\mathcal{J} = \Gamma \times (0,T)$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35B37.

Key words and phrases. observability inequality, heat equation, measurable set, spectral inequality.

The first two authors are supported by Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación grants, MTM2004-03029 and MTM2011-2405.

The last two authors are supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grants 11161130003 and 11171264 and partially by National Basis Research Program of China (973 Program) under grant 2011CB808002.

with ω and Γ accordingly subsets of positive measure and positive surface measure in Ω and $\partial\Omega$, both inequalities (1.2) and (1.3) were built up in [3] with the help of a propagation of smallness estimate from measurable sets for real-analytic functions first established in [43] (See also Theorem 4). For $\mathcal{D} = \omega \times E$, with ω and E accordingly an open subset of Ω and a subset of positive measure in $(0,T)$, the inequality (1.2) (with $\partial\Omega$ is smooth) was proved in [44] with the aid of the Lebeau-Robbiano spectral inequality, and it was then verified for heat equations (where Ω is convex) with lower terms depending on the time variable, through a frequency function method in [39]. When $\mathcal{D} = \omega \times E$, with ω and E accordingly subsets of positive measure in Ω and $(0,T)$, the estimate (1.2) (with $\partial\Omega$ is real-analytic) was obtained in [45].

The purpose of this study is to establish inequalities (1.2) and (1.3), when $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are arbitrary subsets of positive measure and of positive surface measure in $\Omega \times (0,T)$ and $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$ respectively. Such inequalities not only are mathematically interesting but also have important applications in the control theory of the heat equation, such as the bang-bang control, the time optimal control, the null controllability over a measurable set and so on (See Section 5 for the applications).

The starting point we choose here to prove the above-mentioned two inequalities is to assume that the Lebeau-Robbiano spectral inequality stands on Ω. To introduce it, we write

$$0 < \lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 \le \cdots \le \lambda_j \le \cdots$$

for the eigenvalues of $-\Delta$ with the zero Dirichlet boundary condition over $\partial\Omega$, and $\{e_j : j \ge 1\}$ for the set of $L^2(\Omega)$-normalized eigenfunctions, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta e_j + \lambda_j e_j = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ e_j = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

For $\lambda > 0$ we define

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda f = \sum_{\lambda_j \le \lambda} (f, e_j)\, e_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_\lambda^\perp f = \sum_{\lambda_j > \lambda} (f, e_j)\, e_j,$$

where

$$(f, e_j) = \int_\Omega f\, e_j\, dx, \text{ when } f \in L^2(\Omega),\ j \ge 1.$$

Throughout this paper the following notations are effective:

$$(f, g) = \int_\Omega fg\, dx \text{ and } \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = (f, f)^{\frac{1}{2}}\, ;$$

ν is the unit exterior normal vector to $\partial\Omega$; $d\sigma$ is surface measure on $\partial\Omega$; $B_R(x_0)$ stands for the ball centered at x_0 in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of radius R; $\triangle_R(x_0)$ denotes $B_R(x_0) \cap \partial\Omega$; $B_R = B_R(0)$, $\triangle_R = \triangle_R(0)$; for measurable sets $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T)$, $|\omega|$ and $|\mathcal{D}|$ stand for the Lebesgue measures of the sets; for each measurable set $\mathcal{J}$ in $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$, $|\mathcal{J}|$ denotes its surface measure on the lateral boundary of $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$; $\{e^{t\Delta} : t \ge 0\}$ is the semigroup generated by Δ with zero Dirichlet boundary condition over $\partial\Omega$. Consequently, $e^{t\Delta} f$ is the solution of Equation (1.1) with the initial state f in $L^2(\Omega)$. The Lebeau-Robbiano spectral inequality is as follows:

For each $0 < R \le 1$, there is $N = N(\Omega, R)$, such that the inequality

$$\|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(B_R(x_0))} \tag{1.4}$$

holds, when $B_{4R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\lambda > 0$.

To our best knowledge, the inequality (1.4) has been proved under condition that $\partial\Omega$ is at least C^2 [28, 29, 41, 32]. In the current work, we obtain this inequality when Ω is a bounded Lipschitz and locally star-shaped domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (See Definitions 1 and 4 in Section 3). It can be observed from Section 3 that bounded C^1 domains, polygons in the plane, Lipschitz polyhedrons in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $n \geq 3$, and bounded convex domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are always bounded Lipschitz and locally star-shaped (See Remarks 4 and 6 in Section 3).

Our main results related to the observability inequalities are stated as follows:

Theorem 1. *Suppose that a bounded domain Ω verifies the condition (1.4) and $T > 0$. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $R \in (0,1]$ be such that $B_{4R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$. Then, for each measurable set $\mathcal{D} \subset B_R(x_0) \times (0,T)$ with $|\mathcal{D}| > 0$, there is a positive constant $B = B(\Omega, T, R, \mathcal{D})$, such that*

$$\|e^{T\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^B \int_{\mathcal{D}} |e^{t\Delta} f(x)|\, dxdt, \quad \text{when } f \in L^2(\Omega). \tag{1.5}$$

Theorem 2. *Suppose that a bounded Lipschitz domain Ω verifies the condition (1.4) and $T > 0$. Let $q_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $R \in (0,1]$ be such that $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ is real-analytic. Then, for each measurable set $\mathcal{J} \subset \triangle_R(q_0) \times (0,T)$ with $|\mathcal{J}| > 0$, there is a positive constant $B = B(\Omega, T, R, \mathcal{J})$, such that*

$$\|e^{T\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^B \int_{\mathcal{J}} |\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu} e^{t\Delta} f(x)|\, d\sigma dt, \quad \text{when } f \in L^2(\Omega). \tag{1.6}$$

The definition of the real analyticity for $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ is given in Section 4 (See Definition 5).

Theorem 3. *Let Ω be a bounded Lispchitz and locally star-shaped domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, Ω verifies the condition (1.4).*

It deserves mentioning that Theorem 2 also holds when Ω is a Lipschitz polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{J}$ is a measurable subset with positive surface measure of $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$ (See the part *(ii)* in Remark 11).

In this work we use the new strategy developed in [39] to prove parabolic observability inequalities: a mixing of ideas from [34], the global interpolation inequalitiy in Theorems 6 and 10 and the telescoping series method. This new strategy can also be extended to more general parabolic evolutions with variable time-dependent second order coefficients and with unbounded lower order time-dependent coefficients. To do it one must prove the global interpolation inequalities in Theorems 6 and 10 for the corresponding parabolic evolutions. These can be derived in the more general setting from the Carleman inequalities in [8, 9, 12, 15, 25] or from local versions of frequency function arguments [10, 39]. Here we choose to derive the interpolation inequalities only for the heat equation and from the condition (1.4) because it is technically less involved and helps to make the presentation of the basic ideas more clear.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 proves Theorem 1; Section 3 shows Theorem 3; Section 4 verifies Theorem 2; Section 5 presents some applications of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 in the control theory of the heat equation and Section 6 is an Appendix completeting some of the technical details in the work.

2. Interior observability

Throughout this section Ω denotes a bounded domain and T is a positive time. First of all, we recall the following observability estimate or propagation of smallness inequality from measurable sets:

Theorem 4. *Assume that $f : B_{2R} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is real-analytic in B_{2R} verifying*

$$|\partial^\alpha f(x)| \le \frac{M|\alpha|!}{(\rho R)^{|\alpha|}}\ , \ \text{when}\ \ x \in B_{2R},\ \ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n,$$

for some $M > 0$ and $0 < \rho \le 1$. Let $E \subset B_R$ be a measurable set with positive measure. Then, there are positive constants $N = N(\rho, |E|/|B_R|)$ and $\theta = \theta(\rho, |E|/|B_R|)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \le N \left(\fint_E |f|\, dx \right)^\theta M^{1-\theta}. \tag{2.1}$$

The estimate (2.1) is first established in [43] (See also [37] and [38] for other close results). The reader may find a simpler proof of Theorem 4 in [3, §3], the proof there was built with ideas taken from [33], [37] and [43].

Theorem 4 and the condition (1.4) imply the following:

Theorem 5. *Assume that Ω verifies (1.4), ω is a subset of positive measure such that $\omega \subset B_R(x_0)$, with $B_{4R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$, for some $R \in (0, 1]$. Then, there is a positive constant $N = N(\Omega, R, |\omega|/|B_R|)$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^1(\omega)},\ \ \text{when}\ \ f \in L^2(\Omega)\ \ \text{and}\ \ \lambda > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume $x_0 = 0$. Because $B_{4R} \subset \Omega$ and (1.4) stands, there is $N = N(\Omega, R)$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(B_R)},\ \ \text{when}\ \ f \in L^2(\Omega)\ \ \text{and}\ \ \lambda > 0. \tag{2.3}$$

For $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ arbitrarily given, define

$$u(x, y) = \sum_{\lambda_j \le \lambda} (f, e_j) e^{\sqrt{\lambda_j} y} e_j.$$

One can verify that $\Delta u + \partial_y^2 u = 0$ in $B_{4R}(0, 0) \subset \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. Hence, there are $N = N(n)$ and $\rho = \rho(n)$ such that

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta u\|_{L^\infty(B_{2R}(0,0))} \le \frac{N(|\alpha| + \beta)!}{(R\rho)^{|\alpha|+\beta}} \left(\fint_{B_{4R}(0,0)} |u|^2\, dxdy \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\ , \ \text{when}\ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n, \beta \ge 1.$$

For the later see [36, Chapter 5], [22, Chapter 3]. Thus, $\mathcal{E}_\lambda f$ is a real-analytic function in B_{2R}, with the estimates:

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^\infty(B_{2R})} \le N|\alpha|!(R\rho)^{-|\alpha|} \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (-4,4))},\ \text{for}\ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n.$$

By either extending $|u|$ as zero outside of $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, which turns $|u|$ into a subharmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ or the local properties of solutions to elliptic equations [20, Theorems 8.17, 8.25] and the orthonormality of $\{e_j : j \ge 1\}$ in Ω, there is $N = N(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (-4,4))} \le N \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega \times (-5,5))} \le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

The last two inequalities show that

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^\infty(B_{2R})} \le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} |\alpha|!\, (R\rho)^{-|\alpha|}\, \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n,$$

with N and ρ as above. In particular, $\mathcal{E}_\lambda f$ verifies the hypothesis in Theorem 4 with

$$M = N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

and there are $N = N(\Omega, R, |\omega|/|B_R|)$ and $\theta = \theta(\Omega, R, |\omega|/|B_R|)$ with

$$\|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^\infty(B_R)} \le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^1(\omega)}^{\theta} \|\mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\theta}. \tag{2.4}$$

Now, the estimate (2.2) follows from (2.3) and (2.4). □

Theorem 6. *Let Ω, x_0, R and ω be as in Theorem 5. Then, there are $N = N(\Omega, R, |\omega|/|B_R|)$ and $\theta = \theta(\Omega, R, |\omega|/|B_R|) \in (0,1)$, such that*

$$\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(N e^{\frac{N}{t-s}} \|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\omega)} \right)^{\theta} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\theta}, \tag{2.5}$$

when $0 \le s < t$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $0 \le s < t$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. Since

$$\|e^{t\Delta} \mathcal{E}_\lambda^\perp f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \text{ when } f \in L^2(\Omega),$$

it follows from Theorem 5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\le \|e^{t\Delta} \mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|e^{t\Delta} \mathcal{E}_\lambda^\perp f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \|e^{t\Delta} \mathcal{E}_\lambda f\|_{L^1(\omega)} + e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\omega)} + \|e^{t\Delta} \mathcal{E}_\lambda^\perp f\|_{L^2(\omega)} \right] + e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\omega)} + e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it holds that

$$\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\omega)} + e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right]. \tag{2.6}$$

Because

$$\max_{\lambda \ge 0} e^{A\sqrt{\lambda} - \lambda(t-s)} \le e^{\frac{N(A)}{t-s}}, \text{ for all } A > 0,$$

it follows from (2.6) that for each $\lambda > 0$,

$$\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{\frac{N}{t-s}} \left[e^{N\lambda(t-s)} \|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\omega)} + e^{-\lambda(t-s)/N} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right].$$

Setting $\epsilon = e^{-\lambda(t-s)}$ in the above estimate shows that the inequality

$$\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{\frac{N}{t-s}} \left[\epsilon^{-N} \|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\omega)} + \epsilon \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right], \tag{2.7}$$

holds, for all $0 < \epsilon \le 1$. The minimization of the right hand in (2.7) for ϵ in $(0,1)$, as well as the fact that

$$\|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \text{ when } t > s,$$

implies Theorem 6. □

Remark 1. *Theorem 6 shows that the observability or spectral elliptic inequality* (2.2) *implies the inequality* (2.5). *In particular, the elliptic spectral inequality* (1.4) *implies the inequality:*

$$\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(Ne^{\frac{N}{t-s}}\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(B_R(x_0))}\right)^{\theta}\|e^{s\Delta}f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.8}$$

when $0 \le s < t$, $B_{4R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$ *and* $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. *In fact, both* (2.2) *and* (2.5) *or* (1.4) *and* (2.8) *are equivalent, for if* (2.5) *holds, take* $f = \sum_{\lambda_j \le \lambda} e^{\lambda_j/\sqrt{\lambda}}a_j e_j$, $s = 0$ *and* $t = 1/\sqrt{\lambda}$ *in* (2.5) *to derive that*

$$\Big(\sum_{\lambda_j\le\lambda} a_j^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le Ne^{N\sqrt{\lambda}}\Big\|\sum_{\lambda_j\le\lambda} a_j e_j\Big\|_{L^1(\omega)},\ \text{when } a_j \in \mathbb{R},\ j \ge 1, \lambda > 0.$$

The interested reader may want here to compare the previous claims, Theorem 3 and [39, Proposition 2.2].

Lemma 1. *Let* $B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega$ *and* $\mathcal{D} \subset B_R(x_0) \times (0,T)$ *be a subset of positive measure. Set*

$$\mathcal{D}_t = \{x \in \Omega : (x,t) \in \mathcal{D}\},\ E = \{t \in (0,T) : |\mathcal{D}_t| \ge |\mathcal{D}|/(2T)\},\ t \in (0,T).$$

Then, $\mathcal{D}_t \subset \Omega$ *is measurable for a.e.* $t \in (0,T)$, E *is measurable in* $(0,T)$, $|E| \ge |\mathcal{D}|/2|B_R|$ *and*

$$\chi_E(t)\chi_{\mathcal{D}_t}(x) \le \chi_{\mathcal{D}}(x,t),\ \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T). \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. From Fubini's theorem,

$$|\mathcal{D}| = \int_0^T |\mathcal{D}_t|\,dt = \int_E |\mathcal{D}_t|\,dt + \int_{[0,T]\setminus E} |\mathcal{D}_t|\,dt \le |B_R||E| + |\mathcal{D}|/2.$$

□

Theorem 7. *Let* $x_0 \in \Omega$ *and* $R \in (0,1]$ *be such that* $B_{4R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$. *Let* $\mathcal{D} \subset B_R(x_0) \times (0,T)$ *be a measurable set with* $|\mathcal{D}| > 0$. *Write* E *and* $\mathcal{D}_t$ *for the sets associated to* $\mathcal{D}$ *in Lemma 1. Then, for each* $\eta \in (0,1)$, *there are* $N = N(\Omega, R, |\mathcal{D}|/(T|B_R|), \eta)$ *and* $\theta = \theta(\Omega, R, |\mathcal{D}|/(T|B_R|), \eta)$ *with* $\theta \in (0,1)$, *such that*

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds\right)^{\theta}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.10}$$

when $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$, $|E \cap (t_1,t_2)| \ge \eta(t_2 - t_1)$ *and* $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. *Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{t_2-t_1}}\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{q(t_2-t_1)}}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\le N\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds,\ \text{ when } q \ge (N+1-\theta)/(N+1). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. After removing from E a set with zero Lebesgue measure, we may assume that $\mathcal{D}_t$ is measurable for all t in E. From Lemma 1, $\mathcal{D}_t \subset B_R(x_0)$, $B_{4R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$ and $|\mathcal{D}_t|/|B_R| \ge |\mathcal{D}|/(2T|B_R|)$, when t is in E. From Theorem 6, there are $N = N(\Omega, R, |\mathcal{D}|/(T|B_R|))$ and $\theta = \theta(\Omega, R, |\mathcal{D}|/(T|B_R|))$ such that

$$\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(Ne^{\frac{N}{t-s}}\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_t)}\right)^{\theta}\|e^{s\Delta}f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.12}$$

when $0 \le s < t$, $t \in E$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. Let $\eta \in (0,1)$ and $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$ satisfy $|E \cap (t_1,t_2)| \ge \eta(t_2-t_1)$. Set $\tau = t_1 + \frac{\eta}{2}\,(t_2-t_1)$. Then

$$|E \cap (\tau,t_2)| = |E \cap (t_1,t_2)| - |E \cap (t_1,\tau)| \ge \frac{\eta}{2}(t_2-t_1). \tag{2.13}$$

From (2.12) with $s = t_1$ and the decay property of $\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, we get

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(Ne^{\frac{N}{t_2-t_1}}\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_t)}\right)^{\theta}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)},\ t \in E \cap (\tau,t_2). \tag{2.14}$$

The inequality (2.10) follows from the integration with respect to t of (2.14) over $E \cap (\tau,t_2)$, Hölder's inequality with $p = 1/\theta$ and (2.13).

The inequality (2.10) and Young's inequality imply that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \\ &\epsilon\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon^{-\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}}Ne^{\frac{N}{t_2-t_1}}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds, \ \text{ when } \ \epsilon > 0.\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Multiplying first (2.15) by $\epsilon^{\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}}e^{-\frac{N}{t_2-t_1}}$ and then replacing ϵ by ϵ^{θ}, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\epsilon^{1-\theta}e^{-\frac{N}{(t_2-t_1)}}\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - \epsilon\, e^{-\frac{N}{(t_2-t_1)}}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\le N\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds, \ \text{ when } \ \epsilon > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\epsilon = e^{-\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}}$ in the above inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{(t_2-t_1)}}\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - e^{-\frac{N+1}{(t_2-t_1)}}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &\le N\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

This implies (2.11), for $q \ge \frac{N+1-\theta}{N+1}$. □

The reader can find the proof of the following Lemma 2 in either [31, pp. 256-257] or [39, Proposition 2.1].

Lemma 2. *Let E be a subset of positive measure in $(0,T)$. Let l be a density point of E. Then, for each $z > 1$, there is $l_1 = l_1(z,E)$ in (l,T) such that, the sequence $\{l_m\}$ defined as*

$$l_{m+1} = l + z^{-m}\,(l_1 - l)\,,\ m = 1,2,\cdots,$$

verifies

$$|E \cap (l_{m+1},l_m)| \ge \frac{1}{3}\,(l_m - l_{m+1})\,,\ \text{when } m \ge 1. \tag{2.16}$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Let E and $\mathcal{D}_t$ be the sets associated to $\mathcal{D}$ in Lemma 1 and l be a density point in E. For $z > 1$ to be fixed later, $\{l_m\}$ denotes the sequence associated to l and z in Lemma 2. Because (2.16) holds, we may apply Theorem 7, with $\eta = 1/3$, $t_1 = l_{m+1}$ and $t_2 = l_m$, for each $m \ge 1$, to get that there are $N = N(\Omega, R, |\mathcal{D}|/\left(T|B_R|\right)) > 0$ and $\theta = \theta(\Omega, R, |\mathcal{D}|/\left(T|B_R|\right))$, with $\theta \in (0,1)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{l_m-l_{m+1}}}\|e^{l_m\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}-e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{q(l_m-l_{m+1})}}\|e^{l_{m+1}\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&\le N\int_{l_{m+1}}^{l_m}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds,\ \text{ when }\ q\ge\frac{N+1-\theta}{N+1}\ \text{ and }\ m\ge 1.\end{aligned}\tag{2.17}$$

Setting $z=1/q$ in (2.17) (which leads to $1<z\le\frac{N+1}{N+1-\theta}$) and

$$\gamma_z(t)=e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{(z-1)(l_1-l)t}},\ t>0,$$

recalling that

$$l_m-l_{m+1}=z^{-m}\,(z-1)\,(l_1-l)\,,\ \text{for } m\ge 1,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma_z(z^{-m})\|e^{l_m\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}-\gamma_z(z^{-m-1})\|e^{l_{m+1}\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&\le N\int_{l_{m+1}}^{l_m}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds,\ \text{ when }\ m\ge 1.\end{aligned}\tag{2.18}$$

Choose now

$$z=\frac{1}{2}\left(1+\frac{N+1}{N+1-\theta}\right).$$

The choice of z and Lemma 2 determines l_1 in (l,T) and from (2.18),

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma(z^{-m})\|e^{l_m\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}-\gamma(z^{-m-1})\|e^{l_{m+1}\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&\le N\int_{l_{m+1}}^{l_m}\chi_E(s)\|e^{s\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{D}_s)}\,ds,\ \text{ when }\ m\ge 1.\end{aligned}\tag{2.19}$$

with

$$\gamma(t)=e^{-A/t}\ \text{and}\ A=A(\Omega,R,E,|\mathcal{D}|/\left(T|B_R|\right))=\frac{2\left(N+1-\theta\right)^2}{\theta\left(l_1-l\right)}.$$

Finally, because of

$$\|e^{T\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le\|e^{l_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)},\ \sup_{t\ge 0}\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}<+\infty,\ \lim_{t\to 0+}\gamma(t)=0,$$

and (2.9), the addition of the telescoping series in (2.19) gives

$$\|e^{T\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le Ne^{zA}\int_{\mathcal{D}\cap(\Omega\times[l,l_1])}|e^{t\Delta}f(x)|\,dxdt,\ \text{ for }\ f\in L^2(\Omega),$$

which proves (1.5) with $B=zA+\log N$.

□

Remark 2. *The constant B in Theorem 1 depends on E because the choice of $l_1=l_1(z,E)$ in Lemma 2 depends on the possible complex structure of the measurable set E (See the proof of Lemma 2 in* [39, Proposition 2.1]*). When $\mathcal{D}=\omega\times(0,T)$, one may take $l=T/2$, $l_1=T$, $z=2$ and then,*

$$B=A(\Omega,R,|\omega|/|B_R|)/T.$$

Remark 3. *The proof of Theorem 1 also implies the following observability estimate:*

$$\sup_{m\ge 0}\sup_{l_{m+1}\le t\le l_m}e^{-z^{m+1}A}\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le N\int_{\mathcal{D}\cap(\Omega\times[l,l_1])}|e^{t\Delta}f(x)|\,dxdt,$$

for f in $L^2(\Omega)$, and with z, N and A as defined along the proof of Theorem 1. Here, $l_0 = T$.

3. Spectral inequalities

Throughout this section, Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 1. Ω is a Lipschitz domain (sometimes called strongly Lipschitz or Lipschitz graph domains) with constants m and ϱ when for each point p on the boundary of Ω there is a rectangular coordinate system $x = (x', x_n)$ and a Lipschitz function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ verifying

$$\phi(0') = 0, \quad |\phi(x_1') - \phi(x_2')| \le m|x_1' - x_2'|, \text{ for all } x_1', x_2' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \tag{3.1}$$

$p = (0', 0)$ on this coordinate system and

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{m,\varrho} \cap \Omega &= \{(x', x_n) : |x'| < \varrho,\ \phi(x') < x_n < 2m\varrho\}, \\ Z_{m,\varrho} \cap \partial\Omega &= \{(x', \phi(x')) : |x'| < \varrho\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where $Z_{m,\varrho} = B'_\varrho \times (-2m\varrho, 2m\varrho)$.

Definition 2. Ω is a C^1 domain when it is a Lipschitz domain and the functions φ associated to points p in $\partial\Omega$ satisfying (3.1) and (3.2) are in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$. Under such condition, there is

$$\theta : [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty), \text{ with } \theta \text{ nondecreasing, } \lim_{t \to 0^+} \theta(t) = 0,$$

and

$$|\,(q - p) \cdot \nu_q| \le |p - q|\theta(|p - q|), \text{ when } p, q \in \partial\Omega. \tag{3.3}$$

Definition 3. Ω is a lower C^1 domain when it is a Lipschitz domain and

$$\liminf_{q \in \partial\Omega,\, q \to p} \frac{(q - p) \cdot \nu_q}{|q - p|} \ge 0, \text{ for each } p \in \partial\Omega. \tag{3.4}$$

Remark 4. *Polygons in the plane, convex domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (See* [36, p. 72, Lemma 3.4.1] *for a proof that convex domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are Lipschitz domains (pace Morrey, strongly Lipschitz domains)) or Lipschitz polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \ge 3$, are lower C^1 domains. In fact, in all these cases and for $p \in \partial\Omega$, there is $r_p > 0$ such that*

$$(q - p) \cdot \nu_q \ge 0, \text{ for a.e. } q \in B_{r_p}(p) \cap \partial\Omega.$$

When Ω is convex, $r_p = +\infty$. In general, a Lipschitz domain Ω is a lower C^1 domain when the Lipschitz functions ϕ describing its boundary can be discomposed as the sum of two Lipschitz functions, $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2$, with ϕ_1 convex over $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and ϕ_2 satisfying

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \sup_{|x_1' - x_2'| < \epsilon} |\nabla\phi_2(x_1') - \nabla\phi_2(x_2')| = 0.$$

In particular, C^1 domains are lower C^1 domains (See (3.3)*).*

Definition 4. A Lipschitz domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is locally star-shaped when for each $p \in \partial\Omega$ there are x_p in Ω and $r_p > 0$ such that

$$|p - x_p| < r_p \text{ and } B_{r_p}(x_p) \cap \Omega \text{ is star-shaped with center } x_p. \tag{3.5}$$

In particular,

$$(q - x_p) \cdot \nu_q \ge 0, \text{ for a.e. } q \in B_{r_p}(x_p) \cap \partial\Omega.$$

Remark 5. *The compactness of $\partial\Omega$ shows that when Ω is locally star-shaped, there are a finite set $\mathcal{A} \subset \Omega$, $0 < \epsilon, \rho \le 1$ and a family of positive numbers $0 < r_x \le 1$, $x \in \mathcal{A}$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial\Omega \subset \cup_{x\in\mathcal{A}}\, B_{r_x}(x),\ B_{(1+\epsilon)r_x}(x)\cap\Omega \text{ is star-shaped,} \\ &\mathcal{A}\subset\Omega^{4\rho} \text{ and } \overline{\Omega}\setminus\Omega^{4\rho}\subset\cup_{x\in\mathcal{A}}B_{r_x}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Here,

$$\Omega^\eta = \{x\in\Omega : d(x,\partial\Omega) > \eta\},\ \text{when } \eta > 0.$$

Remark 6. *Theorem 8 below shows that polygons in the plane, C^1 domains, convex domains and Lipschitz polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \ge 3$ are locally star-shaped. Lipschitz domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with Lipschitz constant $m < \frac{1}{2}$ are also locally star-shaped. Spite of what happens in the plane not all the polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^3$ are Lipschitz domains (See* [42, p. 496] *or the two-brick domain of* [26, p. 303]*).*

Theorem 8. *Let Ω be a lower C^1 domain. Then, Ω is locally star-shaped.*

Proof. Let (x', x_n) and ϕ be accordingly the rectangular coordinate system and Lipschitz function associated to $p \in \partial\Omega$, satisfying (3.1) and (3.2). Let then, $x_p = p + \delta\, e$, $e = (0', 1)$, and $r_p = 2\delta$, where $\delta > 0$ will be chosen later. Clearly x_p is in Ω, $|p - x_p| < r_p$ and $B_{r_p}(x_p) \subset Z_{m,\varrho}$, when $0 < \delta < \min\{\frac{\varrho}{2}, \frac{2m\varrho}{3}\}$. Moreover, for almost every q in $B_{r_p}(x_p)\cap\partial\Omega$, it holds that $q = (x', \phi(x'))$ for some x' in B'_ρ,

$$\nu_q = \frac{(\nabla\phi(x'), -1)}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla\phi(x')|^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad |q-p| \le r_p + \delta = 3\delta$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (q-x_p)\cdot\nu_q &= (q-p)\cdot\nu_q - \delta\, e\cdot\nu_q \\ &\ge (q-p)\cdot\nu_q + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{1+m^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.4) there is $s_p > 0$ such that

$$(q-p)\cdot\nu_q \ge -\frac{|q-p|}{3\sqrt{1+m^2}},\ \text{when } q\in\partial\Omega \text{ and } |q-p| < s_p. \tag{3.7}$$

Thus, (3.5) holds for the choices we made of x_p, r_p and s_p, provided that δ is chosen with

$$0 < \delta < \min\{\tfrac{\varrho}{2}, \tfrac{2m\varrho}{3}, \tfrac{s_p}{3}\}.$$

□

The proof of Theorem 3 will follow from the following Lemmas 3 and 4.

Lemma 3. *Let Ω be a Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $R > 0$ and assume that $B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega$ is star-shaped with center at some $x_0 \in \overline{\Omega}$. Then,*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_{r_2}(x_0)\cap\Omega)} \le \|u\|^\theta_{L^2(B_{r_1}(x_0)\cap\Omega)}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_{r_3}(x_0)\cap\Omega)},\ \text{with } \theta = \frac{\log\frac{r_3}{r_2}}{\log\frac{r_3}{r_1}}\ , \tag{3.8}$$

when $\Delta u = 0$ in $B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega$, $u = 0$ on $\triangle_R(x_0)$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 < r_3 \le R$.

Remark 7. *See* [27, Lemma 3.1] *for a proof of Lemma 3 and* [1] *and* [2] *for related results but with spheres replacing balls. The relevance of the assumption that* $B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega$ *is star-shaped in the proof of* [27, Lemma 3.1] *is that*

$$(q-x_0)\cdot\nu_q\ge 0,\ \textit{for a.e. } q \textit{ in } B_R(x_0)\cap\partial\Omega$$

and certain terms arising in the arguments can be drop because of their nonnegative sign. In fact, (3.8) *is the logarithmic convexity of the* L^2*-norm of* u *over* $B_r(x_0)\cap\Omega$ *for* $0<r\le R$ *with respect to the variable* $\log r$. *Lemma 3 extends up to the boundary the classical interior three-spheres inequality for harmonic functions, first stablished for complex analytic functions by Hadamard* [21] *and extended for harmonic functions by several authors* [19]*:*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_{r_2}(x_0))}\le\|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_{r_1}(x_0))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_{r_3}(x_0))},\ \textit{with } \theta=\frac{\log\frac{r_3}{r_2}}{\log\frac{r_3}{r_1}}\ , \tag{3.9}$$

when $\Delta u=0$ in Ω, $B_R(x_0)\subset\Omega$ and $0<r_1<r_2<r_3\le R$.

When $B_R(x_0)\subset\Omega$, $B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega$ *is star-shaped, and a proof for* (3.9) *is within the one for* [27, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 4. *Let* Ω *be a Lipischitz domain with constants* m *and* ϱ, $0<r<\varrho/10$ *and* q *be in* $\partial\Omega$. *Then, there are* $N=N(n,m)$ *and* $\theta=\theta(n,m)$, $0<\theta<1$, *such that the inequality*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_r(q)\cap\Omega)}\le Nr^{\frac{3\theta}{2}}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|^{\theta}_{L^2(\Delta_{6r}(q))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_{8r}(q)\cap\Omega)},$$

holds for all harmonic functions u *in* $B_{8r}(q)\cap\Omega$ *satisfying* $u=0$ *on* $B_{8r}(q)\cap\partial\Omega$.

To prove Lemma 4 we use the Carleman inequality in Lemma 5. As far as the authors know, the first L^2-type Carleman inequality with a radial weight and whose proof was worked out in Cartesian coordinates appeared first in [24, Lemma 1]. Lemma 5 borrows ideas from [24, Lemma 1] but the proof here is somehow simpler. In [1, p. 518] also appears an interpolation inequality similar to the one in Lemma 4 but with the L^2-norms replaced by L^1-norms. The inequality in [1, p. 518] holds though its proof in [1] is not correct. It follows from Lemma 4 and properties of harmonic functions.

Lemma 5. *Let* Ω *be a Lipschitz domain in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *with* $\Omega\subset B_R$ *and* $\tau>0$. *Assume that* 0 *is not in* $\overline{\Omega}$. *Then,*

$$\int_\Omega|x|^{-2\tau}u^2\,dx\le\frac{R^2}{4\tau^2}\int_\Omega|x|^{-2\tau+2}\left(\Delta u\right)^2\,dx-\frac{R^2}{2\tau}\int_{\partial\Omega}q\cdot\nu\,|q|^{-2\tau}\left(\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\right)^2\,d\sigma,$$

for all u *in* $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ *satisfying* $u=0$ *on* $\partial\Omega$.

Proof of Lemma 5. Let u be in $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$, $u=0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and define $f=|x|^{-\tau}u$. Then,

$$|x|^{1-\tau}\Delta u=|x|\left(\Delta f+\tfrac{\tau^2}{|x|^2}f\right)+\tfrac{2\tau}{|x|}\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right). \tag{3.10}$$

Square both sides of (3.10) to get

$$\begin{aligned}|x|^{2-2\tau}\left(\Delta u\right)^2=4\tau^2|x|^{-2}\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)^2+|x|^2\left(\triangle f+\tfrac{\tau^2}{|x|^2}f\right)^2\\+4\tau\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)\left(\Delta f+\tfrac{\tau^2}{|x|^2}f\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Observe that

$$\int_\Omega |x|^{-2}\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)f\,dx=\tfrac12\int_{\partial\Omega}\tfrac{q\cdot\nu}{|q|^2}f^2\,d\sigma=0,$$

and integrate (3.11) over Ω. Then we get the identity

$$\int_\Omega |x|^{2-2\tau}\left(\Delta u\right)^2\,dx=4\tau^2\int_\Omega |x|^{-2}\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)^2\,dx \\ +\int_\Omega |x|^2\left(\triangle f+\tfrac{\tau^2}{|x|^2}f\right)^2\,dx+4\tau\int_\Omega\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)\Delta f\,dx. \tag{3.12}$$

The Rellich-Nečas or Pohozaev identity

$$\nabla\cdot\left[x|\nabla f|^2-2\left(x\cdot\nabla f\right)\nabla f\right]+2\left(x\cdot\nabla f\right)\Delta f=(n-2)\left|\nabla f\right|^2$$

and the identity

$$\Delta\left(f^2\right)=2f\Delta f+2\left|\nabla f\right|^2,$$

give the formula

$$\nabla\cdot\left[x|\nabla f|^2-2\left(x\cdot\nabla f\right)\nabla f\right]+2\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)\Delta f=\tfrac{n-2}{2}\Delta(f^2).$$

The integration of this identity over Ω implies the formula

$$4\int_\Omega\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)\Delta f\,dx=2\int_{\partial\Omega}q\cdot\nu\,\left(\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial\nu}\right)^2\,d\sigma, \tag{3.13}$$

and plugging (3.13) into (3.12) gives the identity

$$\int_\Omega |x|^{2-2\tau}\left(\Delta u\right)^2\,dx=4\tau^2\int_\Omega |x|^{-2}\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)^2\,dx \\ +\int_\Omega |x|^2\left(\triangle f+\tfrac{\tau^2}{|x|^2}f\right)^2\,dx+2\tau\int_{\partial\Omega}q\cdot\nu\,\left(\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial\nu}\right)^2\,d\sigma. \tag{3.14}$$

Next, the identity

$$-\int_\Omega\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)f\,dx=\int_\Omega f^2\,dx,$$

the Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and $\Omega\subset B_R$ show that

$$R^{-2}\int_\Omega f^2\,dx\le\int_\Omega |x|^{-2}\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n-2}{2}f\right)^2\,dx. \tag{3.15}$$

Then, Lemma 5 follows from (3.14) and (3.15). □

Proof of Lemma 4. After rescaling and translation we may assume that $q=0$, $r=1$ and that there is a Lipschitz function $\phi:\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ verifying

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi(0')=0,\quad |\phi(x_1')-\phi(x_2')|\le m|x_1'-x_2'|,\ \text{for all } x_1',x_2'\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1},\\ &Z_{m,10}\cap\Omega=\{(x',x_n):|x'|<10,\ \phi(x')<x_n<20m\},\\ &Z_{m,10}\cap\partial\Omega=\{(x',\phi(x')):|x'|<10\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where $Z_{m,10}=B_{10}'\times(-20m,20m)$. Recalling that $e=(0',1)$. Thus, $-e\notin\overline{\Omega}$ and

$$B_1\subset B_2(-e)\subset B_5(-e)\subset B_6. \tag{3.17}$$

Choose ψ in $C_0^\infty(B_5(-e))$ with $\psi\equiv1$ in $B_3(-e)$ and $\psi\equiv0$ outside $B_4(-e)$. From (3.16), there is $\beta\in(0,1)$, $\beta=\beta(m)$, such that

$$B_{2\beta}(-e)\cap\Omega=\emptyset. \tag{3.18}$$

By translating the inequality in Lemma 5 from 0 to $-e$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\||x+e|^{-\tau}f\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\Omega)} \le \left\||x+e|^{-\tau+1}\Delta f\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\Omega)}\\ &+\left\||q+e|^{\frac{1}{2}-\tau}\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial\nu}\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\partial\Omega)},\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

when f is in $C_0^2(B_5(-e)\cap\overline{\Omega})$, $f=0$ on $B_5(-e)\cap\partial\Omega$ and $\tau\ge 20$. Let then u be harmonic in $B_8\cap\Omega$ with $u=0$ on $B_8\cap\partial\Omega$ and take $f=u\psi$ in (3.19). We get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\||x+e|^{-\tau}u\psi\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\Omega)} \le \left\||x+e|^{1-\tau}\left(u\Delta\psi+2\nabla\psi\cdot\nabla u\right)\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\Omega)}\\ &+\left\||q+e|^{\frac{1}{2}-\tau}\psi\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\partial\Omega)},\ \text{ when }\ \tau\ge 20.\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

Next, because $\psi\equiv 1$ on $B_3(-e)$ and (3.17), we have

$$2^{-\tau}\|u\|_{L^2(B_1\cap\Omega)}\le\left\||x+e|^{-\tau}f\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\Omega)},\ \text{when } \tau\ge 1.\tag{3.21}$$

Also, it follows from from (3.18) that

$$\left\||q+e|^{\frac{1}{2}-\tau}\psi\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\partial\Omega)}\le\beta^{-\tau}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\Delta_6)},\ \text{when } \tau\ge 1\ .\tag{3.22}$$

Now, $|\Delta\psi|+|\nabla\psi|$ is supported in $B_4(-e)\setminus B_3(-e)$, where $|x+e|\ge 3$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\||x+e|^{1-\tau}\left(u\Delta\psi+2\nabla\psi\cdot\nabla u\right)\right\|_{L^2(B_5(-e)\cap\Omega)}\\ &\le N3^{-\tau}\left\||u|+|\nabla u|\right\|_{L^2(B_4(-e)\setminus B_3(-e)\cap\Omega)}\\ &\le N3^{-\tau}\|u\|_{L^2(B_6\cap\Omega)},\ \text{ when }\ \tau\ge 1,\ \text{ with }\ N=N(n).\end{aligned}\tag{3.23}$$

Putting together (3.20), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.23), we get

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_1\cap\Omega)}\le N\left[\left(\tfrac{2}{3}\right)^{\tau}\|u\|_{L^2(B_6\cap\Omega)}+\left(\tfrac{2}{\beta}\right)^{\tau}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\Delta_6)}\right],\ \text{when } \tau\ge 20.$$

The later inequality shows that there is $N=N(n,m)\ge 1$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_1\cap\Omega)}\le N\left[\epsilon\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega)}+\epsilon^{-N}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\Delta_6)}\right],\ \text{when } 0<\epsilon\le\left(\tfrac{2}{3}\right)^{20}.\tag{3.24}$$

Finally, the minimization of (3.24) shows that Lemma 4 holds for $q=0$ and $r=1$ and completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Without loss of generality we may assume that $x_0=0$ and $B_{4R}\subset\Omega$ for some fixed $0<R\le 1$. To prove that (1.4) holds with $x_0=0$, we first show that under the hypothesis of Theorem 3, there are ρ and θ in $(0,1)$ and $N\ge 1$ such that the inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega\times[-1,1])}\le N\|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(\Omega^{2\rho}\times[-2,2])}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega\times[-4,4])}\tag{3.25}$$

holds when

$$\begin{cases}\Delta u+\partial_y^2u=0, & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R},\\ u=0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}.\end{cases}\tag{3.26}$$

To prove (3.25), we recall that (3.6) holds and $\mathcal{A}=\{x_1,x_2,\dots,x_l\}$ for some x_i in $\Omega^{4\rho}$, $i=1,\dots,l$, for some $l\ge 1$. Because $B_{(1+\epsilon)r_{x_i}}(x_i)\cap\Omega$ is star-shaped with center x_i, the same holds for $B_{(1+\epsilon)r_{x_i}}(x_i,\tau)\cap\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$ and with center (x_i,τ), $i=1,\dots,l$, for all $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$. Then, from Lemma 3, it follows that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_{r_{x_i}}(x_i,\tau)\cap\Omega\times\mathbb{R})}\le\|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_\rho(x_i,\tau)\cap\Omega\times\mathbb{R})}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_{(1+\epsilon)r_{x_i}}(x_i,\tau)\cap\Omega\times\mathbb{R})},\tag{3.27}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, l$ with

$$\theta = \min\left\{\log\left(1+\epsilon\right)/\log\left(\frac{\left(1+\epsilon\right)r_{x_i}}{\rho}\right) : i = 1, \dots, l\right\}. \tag{3.28}$$

Also, from (3.9)

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_\rho(x,\tau))} \le \|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho}{4}}(x,\tau))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_{2\rho}(x,\tau))}, \text{ with } \theta = \frac{\log 2}{\log 8} \tag{3.29}$$

when x is in the closure of $\Omega^{4\rho}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. Because (3.6), (3.27), (3.29) hold and there are $z_1, \dots, z_m$ in the closure of $\Omega^{4\rho}$ with

$$\overline{\Omega^{4\rho}} \subset \cup_{i=1}^{m} B_\rho(z_i),$$

it is now clear that there are $N = N(l, m, \rho, \mathcal{A}) \ge 1$ and a new $\theta = \theta(l, m, \rho, \mathcal{A})$ in $(0, 1)$ such that (3.25) holds.

From (3.9) with $r_1 = \frac{r}{4}$, $r_2 = r$, $r_3 = 2r$, we see that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_r(x_1,y_1))} \le \|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_{\frac{r}{4}}(x_1,y_1))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_{2r}(x_1,y_1))}, \ \theta = \frac{\log 2}{\log 8}, \tag{3.30}$$

when $B_{2r}(x_1, y_1) \subset \Omega \times [-4, 4]$. From (3.30) and the fact that

$$B_{\frac{r}{4}}(x_1, y_1) \subset B_r(x_2, y_2), \text{ when } (x_2, y_2) \in B_{\frac{r}{4}}(x_1, y_1),$$

we find that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_r(x_1,y_1))} \le \|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_r(x_2,y_2))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega\times[-4,4])}, \ \theta = \frac{\log 2}{\log 8}, \tag{3.31}$$

when $B_{2r}(x_1, y_1) \subset \Omega \times [-4, 4]$, (x_2, y_2) is in $B_{\frac{r}{4}}(x_1, y_1)$ and $r > 0$. Because ρ is now fixed and $\overline{\Omega}$ is compact, there are $0 < r \le 1$ and $k \ge 2$, which depend on ρ, the geometry of Ω and R, such that for all (x_0, y_0) in $\Omega^{2\rho} \times [-2, 2]$ there are k points $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_k, y_k)$ in $\Omega^{2\rho} \times [-2, 2]$ with

$$B_{2r}(x_i, y_i) \subset \Omega \times [-4, 4], \ (x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}) \in B_{\frac{r}{4}}(x_i, y_i), \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, k-1,$$
$$(x_k, y_k) = (0, \tfrac{R}{16}) \text{ and } B_r(0, \tfrac{R}{16}) \subset B^{+}_{\frac{R}{8}}(0, 0).$$

The later and (3.31) show that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_r(x_i,y_i))} \le \|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_r(x_{i+1},y_{i+1}))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega\times[-4,4])}, \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, k-1, \tag{3.32}$$

while the compactness of Ω and the iteration of (3.32) imply that for some new $N = N(l, m, k, \rho, \mathcal{A}, R) \ge 1$ and $0 < \theta = \theta(l, m, k, \rho, \mathcal{A}, R) < 1$

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega^{2\rho}\times[-2,2])} \le N\|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B^{+}_{\frac{R}{8}}(0,0))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega\times[-4,4])}. \tag{3.33}$$

Putting together (3.25) and (3.33), it follows that when u satisfies (3.26),

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega\times[-1,1])} \le N\|u\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B^{+}_{\frac{R}{8}}(0,0))}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega\times[-4,4])}, \tag{3.34}$$

with N and θ as before. Finally, proceeding as in [28], for $\lambda > 0$ we take

$$u(x, y) = \sum_{\lambda_j \le \lambda} a_j \, \frac{\sinh\left(\sqrt{\lambda_j}\, y\right)}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}}\, e_j(x), \tag{3.35}$$

with $\{a_j\}$ a sequence of real numbers. It satisfies (3.26) and also $u(x, 0) \equiv 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$. Then, we may assume that $\frac{R}{8} \le \frac{\varrho}{10}$ and Lemma 4 implies

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{R}{8}}(0,0)^{+})} \le N\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial y}(\cdot, 0)\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_R)}\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega\times[-4,4])}\,. \tag{3.36}$$

Combining (3.34) with (3.36) leads to

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega\times[-1,1])} \le N \|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial y}(\cdot,0)\|^{\theta}_{L^2(B_R)} \|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega\times[-4,4])}.$$

This, along with (3.35) and standard arguments in [29], shows that Ω satisfies the condition (1.4). $\square$

Remark 8. *The reader can now easily derive with arguments based on the Lemmas 3, 4 and Theorem 3, the following spectral inequality:*

Theorem 9. *Suppose that Ω is Lipschitz and verifies* (1.4). *Let $q_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $R \in (0,1]$. Then, there is $N = N(\Omega, R, \tau)$ such that the inequalities*

$$\left(\sum_{\lambda_j \le \lambda} a_j^2 + b_j^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le e^{N\sqrt{\lambda}} \left\| \sum_{\lambda_j \le \lambda} \left(a_j e^{\sqrt{\lambda_j}\, y} + b_j e^{-\sqrt{\lambda_j}\, y}\right) \frac{\partial e_j}{\partial \nu} \right\|_{L^2(B_R(q_0,\tau)\cap \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R})},$$

hold for all sequences $\{a_j\}$ and $\{b_j\}$ in $\mathbb{R}$. In particular, the above inequality holds when Ω is a bounded Lipschitz and locally star-shaped domain.

4. Boundary observability

Throughout this section Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and T is a positive time. We first study quantitative estimates of real analyticity with respect to the space-time variables for caloric functions in $\Omega \times (0,T)$ with zero lateral Dirichlet boundary conditions. Let

$$G(x,y,t) = \sum_{j\ge 1} e^{-\lambda_j t} e_j(x) e_j(y) \tag{4.1}$$

be the Green's function for $\Delta - \partial_t$ on Ω with zero lateral Dirichlet boundary condition. By the maximum principle

$$0 \le G(x,y,t) \le (4\pi t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}\, e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4t}},$$

and

$$G(x,x,t) = \sum_{j\ge 1} e^{-\lambda_j t} e_j(x)^2 \le (4\pi t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}\,. \tag{4.2}$$

Definition 5. Let $q_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $0 < R \le 1$. We say that $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ is real-analytic with constants ϱ and δ if for each $q \in \triangle_{4R}(q_0)$, there are a new rectangular coordinate system where $q = 0$, and a real-analytic function $\phi : B'_\varrho \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ verifying

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi(0') = 0,\ \ |\partial^\alpha \phi(x')| \le |\alpha|!\delta^{-|\alpha|-1}, \ \text{ when } \ x' \in B'_\varrho,\ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1},\\ &B_\varrho \cap \Omega = B_\varrho \cap \{(x', x_n) : x' \in B'_\varrho,\ \ x_n > \phi(x')\},\\ &B_\varrho \cap \partial\Omega = B_\varrho \cap \{(x', x_n) : x' \in B'_\varrho,\ \ x_n = \phi(x')\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, B'_ϱ denotes the open ball of radius ϱ and with center at $0'$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

Lemma 6. *Let $q_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $R \in (0,1]$. Assume that $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ is real-analytic with constants ϱ and δ. Then, there are $N = N(\varrho,\delta)$, $\rho = \rho(\varrho,\delta)$, with $0 < \rho \le 1$, such that*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\beta e^{t\Delta} f(x)| \le \frac{N\,(t-s)^{-\frac{n}{4}}\ e^{8R^2/(t-s)} |\alpha|!\,\beta!}{(R\rho)^{|\alpha|}\left((t-s)/4\right)^{\beta}} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{4.3}$$

when $x \in B_{2R}(q_0) \cap \overline{\Omega}$, $0 \le s < t$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ *and* $\beta \ge 0$.

Proof. It suffices to prove (4.3) for the case when $s = 0$. Let $f = \sum_{j\ge1} a_j e_j$. Set then

$$u(x,t,y) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} a_j e^{-\lambda_j t + \sqrt{\lambda_j} y} e_j(x), \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}, t > 0, y \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$u(x,t) = u(x,t,0) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} a_j e^{-\lambda_j t} e_j(x) = e^{t\Delta} f(x), x \in \overline{\Omega}, t > 0.$$

We have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_y^2 \partial_t^\beta u + \Delta \partial_t^\beta u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \partial_t^\beta u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, \end{cases}$$

$$\partial_t^\beta u(x,t,y) = (-1)^\beta \sum_{j\ge1} a_j \lambda_j^\beta e^{-\lambda_j t + \sqrt{\lambda_j} y} e_j(x). \tag{4.4}$$

Because $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ is real-analytic, there are $N = N(\varrho, \delta)$ and $\rho = \rho(\varrho, \delta)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\beta u(\cdot, t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(B_{2R}(q_0,0)\cap\Omega\times\mathbb{R})} \\ &\le \frac{N|\alpha|!}{(R\rho)^{|\alpha|}} \left(\fint_{B_{4R}(q_0,0)\cap\Omega\times\mathbb{R}} |\partial_t^\beta u(x,t,y)|^2 \, dxdy \right)^{\frac12}, \quad \text{when } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n, \beta \ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

For the later see [36, Chapter 5] and [22, Chapter 3]. Now, it follows from (4.4) that

$$|\partial_t^\beta u(x,t,y)| \le \Big(\sum_{j\ge1} a_j^2\Big)^{\frac12} \Big(\sum_{j\ge1} \lambda_j^{2\beta} e^{-2\lambda_j t + 2\sqrt{\lambda_j} y} e_j(x)^2\Big)^{\frac12}.$$

Also, it stands that

$$\sum_{j\ge1} \lambda_j^{2\beta} e^{-2\lambda_j t + 2\sqrt{\lambda_j} y} e_j(x)^2 = t^{-2\beta} e^{y^2/t} \sum_{j\ge1} (\lambda_j t)^{2\beta} e^{-\lambda_j t} e_j(x)^2 e^{-\left(\sqrt{\lambda_j t} - \frac{y}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^2}$$

$$\le t^{-2\beta} e^{y^2/t} \sum_{j\ge1} (\lambda_j t)^{2\beta} e^{-\lambda_j t} e_j(x)^2 = t^{-2\beta} e^{y^2/t} \sum_{j\ge1} (\lambda_j t)^{2\beta} e^{-\lambda_j t/2} e^{-\lambda_j t/2} e_j(x)^2.$$

Next Stirling's formula shows that

$$\max_{x\ge0} x^{2\beta} e^{-x/2} = 4^{4\beta} \beta^{2\beta} e^{-2\beta} \lesssim 4^{4\beta} (\beta!)^2, \quad \text{when } \beta \ge 0.$$

Finally, the above three inequalities, as well as (4.2), imply that

$$|\partial_t^\beta u(x,t,y)| \le \Big(2\pi t\Big)^{-\frac{n}{4}} e^{y^2/2t} \Big(\sum_{j\ge1} a_j^2\Big)^{\frac12} (t/4)^{-\beta} \beta!, \tag{4.6}$$

for $t > 0$, $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta \ge 0$. The later inequality and (4.5) imply that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\beta u(x,t)| \le \frac{N t^{-\frac{n}{4}} e^{8R^2/t} |\alpha|! \, \beta!}{(R\rho)^{|\alpha|} (t/4)^\beta} \Big(\sum_{j\ge1} a_j^2\Big)^{\frac12},$$

when $x \in B_{2R}(q_0) \cap \overline{\Omega}$, $t > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\beta \ge 0$. □

The next caloric interpolation inequality plays the same role for the boundary case as the inequality (2.8) for the interior case.

Theorem 10. *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with constants (m,ϱ) and satisfy the condition (1.4). Then, given $0<R\le 1$, $0\le t_1<t_2\le T\le 1$ and $q\in\partial\Omega$, there are $N=N(\Omega,R,m,\varrho)\ge 1$ and $\theta=\theta(m,\varrho)$, with $\theta\in(0,1)$, such that*

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le\left(Ne^{\frac{N}{t_2-t_1}}\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\,e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Delta_R(q)\times(t_1,t_2))}\right)^{\theta}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)},\ f\in L^2(\Omega).$$

To prove Theorem 10, we need first some lemmas. We begin with the following Carleman inequality (See [9] and [11]).

Lemma 7. *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with constants (m,ϱ), $0\notin\Omega$ and $\sigma(t)=te^{-Mt}$, $M>0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{\tau M}\|\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x|^2/8t}h\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&\le\|t^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x|^2/8t}(\Delta+\partial_t)h\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&+\||q|^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|q|^2/8t}\tfrac{\partial h}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,+\infty))},\end{aligned}$$

when $\tau\ge 1$ and $h\in C_0^\infty(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,+\infty))$ with $h=0$ on $\partial\Omega\times[0,+\infty)$.

Proof. First, let $f=\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x^2|/8t}h$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x|^2/8t}(\Delta+\partial_t)h=\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x|^2/8t}(\Delta+\partial_t)(\sigma(t)^{\tau}e^{|x|^2/8t}f)\\&=\Delta f-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}\,f+\tau\partial_t(\log\sigma)f+\partial_t f+\tfrac{x}{2t}\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{4t}\,f\ .\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\|t^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x|^2/8t}(\Delta+\partial_t)u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&=\|t^{1/2}(\Delta f-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}f+\tau\partial_t(\log\sigma)f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&+\|t^{1/2}(\partial_t f+\tfrac{x}{2t}\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{4t}f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&+\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}2t(\Delta f-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}\,f+\tau\partial_t(\log\sigma)f)(\partial_t f+\tfrac{x}{2t}\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{4t}\,f)\,dxdt.\end{aligned}\tag{4.7}$$

Next, integrating by parts we have the following two identities:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}2t\partial_t f\Delta f\,dxdt\\&=\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}-t\partial_t|\nabla f|^2+2t\nabla\cdot(\partial_t f\nabla f)\,dxdt=\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}|\nabla f|^2\,dxdt.\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}2t\partial_t f\left(-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}\,f+\tau\partial_t(\log\sigma)f\right)dxdt\\&=\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t}\,\partial_t f^2+\tau t\partial_t(\log\sigma)\partial_t f^2\,dxdt\\&=\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}\,f^2-\tau\partial_t\left(t\partial_t(\log\sigma)\right)f^2\,dxdt.\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

The Rellich-Nečas or Pohosaev identity

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla\cdot\left[\left(x|\nabla f|^2\right)-2\left(x\cdot\nabla f\right)\nabla f\right]=(n-2)|\nabla f|^2-2\left(x\cdot\nabla f\right)\Delta f\\&=(n-2)|\nabla f|^2-2\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{2}\,f\right)\Delta f+nf\Delta f\\&=\tfrac{n}{2}\,\Delta(f^2)-2|\nabla f|^2-2\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{2}\,f\right)\Delta f\end{aligned}$$

gives the formula

$$\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{2}\,f\right)\Delta f=\nabla\cdot\left[\left(x\cdot\nabla f\right)\nabla f-\tfrac{x}{2}\,|\nabla f|^2\right]+\tfrac{n}{4}\,\Delta(f^2)-|\nabla f|^2.$$

Integrating the above identity in Ω, we get that for each $t>0$,

$$\int_\Omega\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{4}\,f\right)\Delta f\,dx=\tfrac12\int_{\partial\Omega}q\cdot\nu\left(\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial\nu}\right)^2\,d\sigma-\int_\Omega|\nabla f|^2\,dx. \tag{4.10}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}\left(x\cdot\nabla f+\tfrac{n}{2}\,f\right)\left(-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}\,f+\tau\partial_t(\log\sigma)f\right)\,dxdt\\&=\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}\tfrac{x}{2}\cdot\nabla\left(f^2\right)\left(-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}+\tau\partial_t\left(\log\sigma\right)\right)\,dxdt\\&+\tfrac{n}{2}\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}\left(\tau\partial_t\left(\log\sigma\right)-\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}\right)f^2\,dxdt\\&=-\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}\tfrac{|x|^2}{16t^2}\,f^2\,dxdt.\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Combining (4.7) and the identities (4.8), (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\|t^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x|^2/8t}(\Delta+\partial_t)h\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&\ge-\tau\int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}\partial_t\left(t\partial_t\left(\log\sigma\right)\right)f^2\,dxdt+\int_{\partial\Omega\times(0,+\infty)}\tfrac12 q\cdot\nu\left(\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial\nu}\right)^2\,d\sigma dt.\end{aligned}$$

Choose then, $\sigma(t)=te^{-Mt}$, $M>0$, $\partial_t(t\partial_t(\log\sigma))=-M$, and it leads to the desired estimate. □

In Lemmas 8, 9, 10 and 11, we assume that Ω is a Lipschitz domain with constants (m,ϱ) and $0\in\partial\Omega$. In Lemmas 8 and 11 we also assume that Ω is near the origin, the region above the graph, $x_n=\phi(x')$, with ϕ as in (3.1) and (3.2), so that $-\rho\,e$ is not in Ω, when $0<\rho\le m\varrho$, $e=(0',1)$.

Lemma 8. *Let $\sigma(t)=te^{-t}$. Then, for $0<\rho\le m\varrho$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{\tau}\|\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t}h\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&\le\|t^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t}\left(\Delta+\partial_t\right)h\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&+\||q+\rho e|^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|q+\rho e|^2/8t}\tfrac{\partial h}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,+\infty))},\end{aligned}$$

when $\tau\ge1$ and $h\in C_0^\infty(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,+\infty))$ with $h=0$ on $\partial\Omega\times[0,+\infty)$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 7 by translation. □

Lemma 9. *There is $N=N(n)$ such that*

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_R\cap\Omega\times(0,T/2))}\le N\sqrt{R^{-2}+T^{-1}}\,\|u\|_{L^2(B_{4R/3}\cap\Omega\times(0,T))},$$

when u satisfies $\partial_t u+\Delta u=0$ in $B_{4R/3}\cap\Omega\times[0,T]$, $u=0$ on $\triangle_{4R/3}\times[0,T]$, for some R, $T>0$.

Proof. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\alpha \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that $\psi = 1$ in B_R, $\psi = 0$ outside $B_{7R/6}$,$0 \le \psi \le 1$, $|\Delta\psi| \le NR^{-2}$; $\alpha = 1$ in $(-\infty, T/2]$, $\alpha = 0$ in $[\frac{3T}{4}, +\infty)$, $0 \le \alpha \le 1$ and $|\partial_t \alpha| \le N/T$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_R\cap\Omega\times(0,T/2))} 2|\nabla u|^2\,dxdt \le \int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)} \psi(x)\alpha(t)\left(\Delta+\partial_t\right)\left(u^2\right)dxdt\\
&= \int_{\Omega\times(0,+\infty)} (\Delta-\partial_t)(\psi(x)\alpha(t))u^2(x,t)\,dxdt - \int_\Omega \psi(x)u^2(x,0)\,dx\\
&\le N(R^{-2}+T^{-1})\int_{B_{4R/3}\cap\Omega\times(0,T)} u^2\,dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 10. *Let $0 < \rho \le 1$ and $T > 0$. Then, there is $N = N(n)$ such that*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega)} \ge \tfrac{1}{2}\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}, \tag{4.12}$$

when

$$0 < t \le \min\left\{\frac{T}{2},\ \frac{\rho^2}{N\log^+\left(\frac{N\|u\|_{L^2(B_4\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}}{\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}}\right)}\right\} \tag{4.13}$$

and u verifies $\partial_t u + \Delta u = 0$ in $B_4\cap\Omega\times[0,T]$, $u = 0$ on $\triangle_4\times[0,T]$.

Here, $\log^+ x = \max\{\log x, 0\}$ and $\frac{1}{0} = +\infty$.

Proof. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B_{3\rho})$ verify $\psi = 1$ in $B_{2\rho}$, $0 \le \psi \le 1$ and $\rho|\nabla\psi| + \rho^2|D^2\psi| \le N$. Set $f(x,t) = u(x,t)\psi(x)$. Then

$$|\Delta f + \partial_t f| \le N\left(\rho^{-2}|u| + \rho^{-1}|\nabla u|\right)\chi_{B_{3\rho}\setminus B_{2\rho}}, \text{ in } \Omega\times[0,T].$$

Define

$$H(t) = \int_\Omega f^2(x,t)G(x-y,t)\,dx, \text{ when } t>0,\ \ y\in B_\rho\cap\Omega,$$

with $G(x,t) = (4\pi t)^{-\frac{n}{2}}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tfrac{d}{dt}H(t) = 2\int_\Omega \left(f(\Delta f+\partial_t f) + |\nabla f|^2\right)G(x-y,t)\,dx\\
&\ge -N\int_{(B_{3\rho}\setminus B_{2\rho})\cap\Omega} \left(\rho^{-2}|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2\right)G(x-y,t)\,dx\\
&\ge -Nt^{-n/2}e^{-\rho^2/4t}\int_{B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega} \rho^{-2}|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2\,dx\\
&\ge -N\rho^{-n}e^{-\rho^2/8t}\int_{B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega} \rho^{-2}|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2\,dx,
\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < t < T$. Integrating the above inequality in $(0,t)$,

$$\int_\Omega f^2(x,t)G(x-y,t)\,dx - u^2(y,0) \ge -N\rho^{-n}e^{-\rho^2/8t}\int_{B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega}\int_0^t \rho^{-2}|u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2\,d\tau dx$$

This, along with Lemma 9 with $R = 3\rho$, $\frac{T}{2} = t$, shows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega} u^2(x,t)G(x-y,t)\,dx - u^2(y,0)\\&\geq -N\rho^{-n-2}(1+\rho^2/t)e^{-\rho^2/8t}\int_{B_{4\rho}\cap\Omega}\int_0^{2t} u^2(x,\tau)\,dxd\tau\\&\geq -N\rho^{-n-2}e^{-\rho^2/16t}\int_{B_{4\rho}\cap\Omega}\int_0^{2t} u^2(x,\tau)\,dxd\tau,\end{aligned}$$

when $y \in B_\rho \cap \Omega$, $0 < 2t \leq T$. Integrating the above inequality for $y \in B_\rho \cap \Omega$ and recalling that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G(x-y,t)\,dy = 1, \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ t > 0,$$

we get

$$\int_{B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega} u^2(x,t)\,dx \geq \int_{B_\rho\cap\Omega} u^2(y,0)\,dy - N\rho^{-2}e^{-\rho^2/16t}\|u\|^2_{L^2(B_{4\rho}\cap\Omega\times[0,2t])},$$

when $0 < 2t \leq T$. The last inequality shows that (4.12) holds when t verifies (4.13) with $N = N(n)$. □

Lemma 11. *There are $\rho \in (0,1)$, $N = N(m,\varrho) \geq 1$ and $\theta = \theta(m,\varrho)$ with $\theta \in (0,1)$, such that*

$$\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)} \leq \left(Ne^{N/T}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times[0,T])}\right)^\theta \|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}, \tag{4.14}$$

when u verifies $\partial_t u + \Delta u = 0$ in $B_8 \cap \Omega \times [0,T]$, $u = 0$ on $\triangle_8 \times [0,T]$

The readers can find a similar interpolation inequality to (4.14) in [6, Theorem 4.6] though not with optimal T dependency, so that its application to observability boundary inequalities does not imply optimal cost constants.

Proof. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\alpha \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that $\psi = 1$ in B_4, $\psi = 0$ outside B_5, $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$, $|\nabla\psi| + |D^2\psi| \leq 1$; $\alpha = 1$ in $(-\infty,1]$, $\alpha = 0$ in $[2,+\infty)$, $0 \leq \alpha(t) \leq 1$ and $|\partial_t\alpha(t)| \leq 1$. Let τ is a positive number verifying $\frac{4}{\tau} \leq \min\{T,1\}$. Take $h(x,t) = u(x,t)\psi(x+\rho e)\alpha(\tau t)$ in Lemma 8. Here, $\rho \in (0,1)$ will be fixed later. Then,

$$|\Delta h + \partial_t h| \leq [(1+\tau)|u| + |\nabla u|]\,\chi_E(x,t),$$

with

$$E = B_5(-\rho e) \cap \Omega \times [0, \tfrac{2}{\tau}] \setminus B_4(-\rho e) \cap \Omega \times [0, \tfrac{1}{\tau}].$$

Since $\frac{t}{e} \leq \sigma(t) \leq t$ in $(0,1)$, where σ is as in Lemma 8, we have

$$t^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t} \leq e^\tau t^{1/2-\tau}e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t} \leq e^\tau\tau^{\tau-1/2}, \text{ when } (x,t) \in E.$$

The later inequality shows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|t^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}(\Delta h + \partial_t h)e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t}\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\&\leq e^\tau\tau^{\tau-1/2}\,\|(1+\tau)|u| + |\nabla u|\|_{L^2(B_6\cap\Omega\times[0,\frac{2}{\tau}])}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

From Lemma 9 with $R = 6$ and $T = \frac{2}{\tau}$, we get

$$\|(1+\tau)|u| + |\nabla u|\|_{L^2(B_6\cap\Omega\times[0,\frac{2}{\tau}])} \leq N\tau\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}. \tag{4.16}$$

From (4.15) and (4.16), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|t^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}(\Delta h+\partial_t h)e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t}\|_{L^2(\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\ &\le e^{\tau}\tau^{\tau+\frac12}N\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])},\quad N=N(n).\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

Next, because $\partial\Omega$ is Lipschitz, there is a positive number $\beta=\beta(m,\varrho)$ such that $\Omega\cap B_{2\beta\rho}(-\rho e)=\emptyset$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&|q+\rho e|^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|q+\rho e|^2/8t}\le\sqrt8\,e^{\tau}t^{-\tau}e^{-\frac{\beta^2\rho^2}{2t}}\\ &\le\sqrt8\left(\tfrac{\beta^2\rho^2}{2}\right)^{-\tau}\tau^{\tau},\ \text{ on }\ B_5(-\rho e)\cap\partial\Omega\times(0,1).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\||q+\rho e|^{1/2}\sigma(t)^{-\tau}e^{-|q+\rho e|^2/8t}\tfrac{\partial h}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,+\infty))}\\ &\qquad\le\sqrt8\left(\tfrac{2}{\beta^2\rho^2}\right)^{\tau}\tau^{\tau}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times(0,T))}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.18}$$

From (4.17) and (4.18) and Lemma 8, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau^{1/2}\|t^{-\tau}e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t}u\|_{L^2(B_4(-\rho e)\cap\Omega\times[0,\frac1\tau])}\\ &\le N\left[e^{\tau}\tau^{\tau+1/2}\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times(0,T))}+\left(\tfrac{2}{\beta^2\rho^2}\right)^{\tau}\tau^{\tau}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times(0,T))}\right],\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

for $\frac4\tau\le\min\{1,T\}$ and with $N=N(m,\varrho,n)$. Because

$$B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega\times[\tfrac{\rho^2}{2\tau},\tfrac{\rho^2}{\tau}]\subset B_{4\rho}(-\rho e)\cap\Omega\times[\tfrac{\rho^2}{2\tau},\tfrac{\rho^2}{\tau}]\subset B_{4\rho}(-\rho e)\cap\Omega\times[0,\tfrac1\tau],$$

we have

$$\tau^{1/2}t^{-\tau}e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t}\ge\tau^{\tau+1/2}\rho^{-2\tau}e^{-4\tau},\ \text{for }(x,t)\in B_{4\rho}(-\rho e)\cap\Omega\times[\tfrac{\rho^2}{2\tau},\tfrac{\rho^2}{\tau}].$$

Hence, the left hand side of (4.19) verifies

$$\tau^{1/2}\|t^{-\tau}e^{-|x+\rho e|^2/8t}u\|_{L^2(B_4(-\rho e)\cap\Omega\times[0,\frac1\tau])}\ge\tau^{\tau+1/2}\rho^{-2\tau}e^{-4\tau}\|u\|_{L^2(B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega\times[\frac{\rho^2}{2\tau},\frac{\rho^2}{\tau}])}.\tag{4.20}$$

Also, from Lemma 10,

$$\|u\|_{L^2(B_{3\rho}\cap\Omega\times[\frac{\rho^2}{2\tau},\frac{\rho^2}{\tau}])}\ge\frac{\rho}{\sqrt8}\tau^{-1/2}\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)},$$

when

$$\tfrac1\tau\le\min\left\{T,\ \frac{1}{N\log^+\left(\frac{N\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}}{\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}}\right)}\right\}.$$

This, along with (4.19) and (4.20), shows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau^{\tau}\rho^{-2\tau}e^{-4\tau}\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}\\ &\qquad\le N\left[e^{\tau}\tau^{\tau+1/2}\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}+\left(\tfrac{2}{\beta^2\rho^2}\right)^{\tau}\tau^{\tau}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times(0,T))}\right],\end{aligned}$$

when

$$\tfrac1\tau\le\min\left\{\tfrac14,\ \ \tfrac{T}{4},\ \frac{1}{N\log^+\left(\frac{N\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}}{\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}}\right)}\right\}.\tag{4.21}$$

Thus, there is $N=N(m,\varrho,n)$ such that

$$\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}\le\left(e^7\rho^2\right)^{\tau}\tfrac{N}{2}\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}+N^{\tau}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times[0,T])},\tag{4.22}$$

when τ satisfies (4.21). Fix now ρ so that $e^7\rho^2 = e^{-1}$ and choose

$$\tau = 4 + \tfrac{4}{T} + N\log^+\left(\tfrac{N\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}}{\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}}\right). \tag{4.23}$$

Clearly, τ verifies (4.21). Moreover,

$$\left(e^7\rho^2\right)^\tau \tfrac{N}{2}\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])} = e^{-\tau}\left(\frac{\frac{N}{2}\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}}{\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}}\right)\left(\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}\right)$$
$$\le \frac{\rho}{2}\,\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}.$$

This, together with (4.22) shows that

$$\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)} \le 2N^\tau\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times[0,T])}.$$

From (4.23), it follows that

$$N^\tau = e^{\tau\log N} = e^{(4+\frac{4}{T})\log N}\left(\tfrac{N\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}}{\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}}\right)^{N\log N},$$

and then we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\rho\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}\right]^{1+N\log N}\\ &\le e^{(4+\frac{4}{T})\log N}\left(N\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}\right)^{N\log N}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times[0,T])}\\ &\le \left(Ne^{\frac{N}{T}}\|u\|_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}\right)^{N\log N}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times[0,T])}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_\rho\cap\Omega)}\\ &\le \left(Ne^{N/T}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_8\times[0,T])}\right)^\theta\|u\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(B_8\cap\Omega\times[0,T])},\ \theta = \frac{1}{1+N\log N}.\end{aligned}$$

□

By translation and rescaling, Lemma 11 is equivalent to the following:

Lemma 12. *Let Ω be a Lipschitz domain with constants (m,ϱ), $0<R\le 1$, $q\in\partial\Omega$, and $T>0$. Then, there are $\rho\in(0,1]$, $N=N(m,\varrho,n)\ge 1$ and $\theta=\theta(m,\varrho,n)$, with $\theta\in(0,1)$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u(0)\|_{L^2(B_{\rho R}(q)\cap\Omega)}\\ &\quad\le \left(Ne^{NR^2/T}R^{\frac12}\|\tfrac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\|_{L^2(\triangle_{8R}(q)\times[0,T])}\right)^\theta\left(R^{-1}\|u\|_{L^2(B_{8R}(q)\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}\right)^{1-\theta},\end{aligned}$$

when u verifies $\partial_t u+\Delta u=0$ in $B_{8R}(q)\cap\Omega\times[0,T]$ and $u=0$ on $\triangle_{8R}(q)\times[0,T]$.

Proof of Theorem 10. It suffices to prove Theorem 10 when $t_2=T$, $t_1=0$ and $q=0$. From Theorem 6 or (2.8), there are $N=N(\Omega,R)$ and $0<\theta_1<1$, $\theta_1=\theta_1(\Omega,R)$ such that

$$\|e^{T\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(Ne^{N/T}\|e^{T\Delta}f\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{\rho R}{20}}(0',\frac{\rho R}{2}))}\right)^{\theta_1}\|f\|^{1-\theta_1}_{L^2(\Omega)},\quad f\in L^2(\Omega). \tag{4.24}$$

with $\rho \in (0,1)$ as in Lemma 12. On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 12 that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|e^{T\Delta}f\|_{L^2(B_{\rho R}\cap\Omega)}\\ &\leq \left(Ne^{N/T}\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\,e^{(T-t)\Delta}f\|_{L^2(B_{8R}\cap\partial\Omega\times[0,T])}\right)^{\theta_2}\|e^{(T-t)\Delta}f\|^{1-\theta_2}_{L^2(B_{8R}\cap\Omega\times[0,T])}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\|e^{T\Delta}f\|_{L^2(B_{\rho R}\cap\Omega)} \leq \left(Ne^{N/T}\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\,e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Delta_{8R}\times[0,T])}\right)^{\theta_2}\|f\|^{1-\theta_2}_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

This, together with (4.24) and $B_{\frac{\rho R}{20}}(0',\frac{\rho R}{2})\subset B_{\rho R}\cap\Omega$, leads to the desired estimate. □

Remark 9. *It follows from Theorem 10 that there are constants* $N = N(\Omega, R, n)$ *and* $\theta = \theta(\Omega, n)$, $\theta\in(0,1)$, *such that*

$$\|e^{T\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \left(Ne^{N/[(\epsilon_2-\epsilon_1)T]}\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\,e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Delta_R(q)\times[\epsilon_1T,\epsilon_2T])}\right)^{\theta}\|f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)},\tag{4.25}$$

when $f\in L^2(\Omega)$ *and* $0<\epsilon_1<\epsilon_2<1$.

Lemma 13 below is a rescaled and translated version of [3, Lemma 2].

Lemma 13. *Let* f *be analytic in* $[a, a+L]$ *with* $a\in\mathbb{R}$ *and* $L>0$, F *be a measurable set in* $[a, a+L]$. *Assume that there are positive constants* M *and* ρ *such that*

$$|f^{(k)}(x)|\leq Mk!(2\rho L)^{-k},\ \text{for}\ k\geq 0,\ x\in[a,a+L].\tag{4.26}$$

Then, there are $N = N(\rho, |F|/L)$ *and* $\gamma = \gamma(\rho, |F|/L)$ *with* $\gamma\in(0,1)$, *such that*

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty(a,a+L)}\leq N\left(\fint_E |f|\,d\tau\right)^{\gamma}M^{1-\gamma}.$$

Lemma 14. *Let* $q_0\in\partial\Omega$ *and* $\mathfrak{J}\subset\triangle_R(q_0)\times(0,T)$ *be a subset with* $|\mathfrak{J}|>0$. *Set*

$$\mathfrak{J}_t=\{x\in\partial\Omega : (x,t)\in\mathfrak{J}\},\ E=\{t\in(0,T): |\mathfrak{J}_t|\geq|\mathfrak{J}|/(2T)\},\ t\in(0,T).$$

Then, $\mathfrak{J}_t\subset\triangle_R(q_0)$ *is measurable for a.e.* $t\in(0,T)$, E *is measurable in* $(0,T)$, $|E|\geq|\mathfrak{J}|/(2|\triangle_R(q_0)|)$ *and* $\chi_E(t)\chi_{\mathfrak{J}_t}(x)\leq\chi_{\mathfrak{J}}(x,t)$ *over* $\partial\Omega\times(0,T)$.

Proof. From Fubini's theorem,

$$|\mathfrak{J}|=\int_0^T|\mathfrak{J}_t|\,dt=\int_E|\mathfrak{J}_t|\,dt+\int_{[0,T]\setminus E}|\mathfrak{J}_t|\,dt\leq|\triangle_R(x_0)||E|+|\mathfrak{J}|/2.$$

□

Theorem 11. *Suppose that* Ω *verifies the condition* (1.4). *Assume that* $q_0\in\partial\Omega$ *and* $R\in(0,1]$ *such that* $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ *is real-analytic. Let* $\mathfrak{J}$ *be a subset in* $\triangle_R(q_0)\times(0,T)$ *of positive surface measure on* $\partial\Omega\times(0,T)$, E *and* $\mathfrak{J}_t$ *be the measurable sets associated to* $\mathfrak{J}$ *in Lemma 14. Then, for each* $\eta\in(0,1)$, *there are* $N = N(\Omega, R, |\mathfrak{J}|/(T|\triangle_R(q_0)|),\eta)$ *and* $\theta=\theta(\Omega,R,|\mathfrak{J}|/(T|\triangle_R(q_0)|),\eta)$ *with* $\theta\in(0,1)$, *such that the inequality*

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\leq\left(Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\chi_E(t)\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^1(\mathfrak{J}_t)}\,dt\right)^{\theta}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)},\tag{4.27}$$

holds, when $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ *with* $t_2 - t_1 < 1$, $|E \cap (t_1, t_2)| \geq \eta(t_2 - t_1)$ *and* $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. *Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{t_2-t_1}} \|e^{t_2\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{q(t_2-t_1)}} \|e^{t_1\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq N \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \chi_E(t) \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\mathfrak{J}_t)}\, dt, \quad \textit{when} \quad q \geq \tfrac{N+1-\theta}{N+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Proof. Because $\triangle_{4R}(x_0)$ is real-analytic, according to Lemma 6, there are $N = N(\varrho, \delta)$ and $\rho = \rho(\varrho, \delta)$, $0 < \rho \leq 1$, such that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_t^\beta e^{t\Delta} f(x)| \leq \frac{N\,(t-s)^{-\frac{n}{4}}\; e^{8R^2/(t-s)} |\alpha|!\, \beta!}{(R\rho)^{|\alpha|}\, ((t-s)/4)^\beta} \|e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{4.29}$$

when $x \in \triangle_{2R}(x_0)$, $0 \leq s < t$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\beta \geq 0$.

Let $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ with $t_2 - t_1 < 1$, $\mathfrak{J}$ be a subset in $\triangle_R(x_0) \times (0, T)$ with positive surface measure in $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$. Let $\mathfrak{J}_t$ and E be the measurable sets associated to $\mathfrak{J}$ in Lemma 14. Assume that $\eta \in (0, 1)$ satisfies

$$|E \cap (t_1, t_2)| \geq \eta(t_2 - t_1).$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau = t_1 + \frac{\eta}{20}(t_2 - t_1),\ \tilde{t}_1 = t_1 + \frac{\eta}{8}(t_2 - t_1), \\ \tilde{t}_2 = t_2 - \frac{\eta}{8}(t_2 - t_1),\ \tilde{\tau} = t_2 - \frac{\eta}{20}(t_2 - t_1). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$t_1 < \tau < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{t}_2 < \tilde{\tau} < t_2 \text{ and } |E \cap (\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2)| \geq \tfrac{3\eta}{4}(t_2 - t_1).$$

Taking $T = t_2 - t_1$ (This T is different from the time T in Theorem 11 and only used here), $\epsilon_1 = \frac{\eta}{20}$, $\epsilon_2 = 1 - \frac{\eta}{20}$ and replacing f by $e^{t_1\Delta} f$ in (4.25), we get

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq N e^{N/(t_2-t_1)} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|^\theta_{L^2(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\ \tilde{\tau}))} \|e^{t_1\Delta} f\|^{1-\theta}_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{4.30}$$

with $N = N(\Omega, R, \eta)$ and $\theta = \theta(\Omega) \in (0, 1)$. From (4.29) with $\beta = 0$, $|\alpha| = 1$ and $s = t_1$, there is $N = N(\Omega, R, \eta)$ such that

$$\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^\infty(\triangle_{2R}(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))} \leq N e^{N/(t_2-t_1)} \|e^{t_1\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\ . \tag{4.31}$$

Next, (4.30), the interpolation inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))} \\ & \leq \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|^{1/2}_{L^1(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|^{1/2}_{L^\infty(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))} \end{aligned}$$

and (4.31) yield

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq N e^{N/(t_2-t_1)} \|e^{t_1\Delta} f\|^{1-\theta/2}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|^{\theta/2}_{L^1(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))}, \tag{4.32}$$

with $N = N(\Omega, R, \eta)$ and $\theta = \theta(\Omega) \in (0, 1)$. Next, setting

$$v(x, t) = \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f(x), \text{ for } x \in \triangle_{2R}(x_0), \quad t > 0,$$

we have

$$\|v\|_{L^1(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))} \leq (\tilde{\tau} - \tau) \int_{\triangle_R(x_0)} \|v(x, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\tau,\tilde{\tau})}\, d\sigma\, . \tag{4.33}$$

Write $[\tau,\tilde{\tau}]=[a,a+L]$, with $a=\tau$ and $L=\tilde{\tau}-\tau=(1-\frac{\eta}{10})(t_2-t_1)$. Also, (4.29) with $|\alpha|=1$ and $s=t_1$ shows that there is $N=N(\Omega,R,\eta)$ such that for each fixed $x\in\triangle_{2R}(x_0)$, $t\in[\tau,\tilde{\tau}]$ and $\beta\geq 0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\partial_t^\beta v(x,t)| &\leq \frac{Ne^{N/(t-t_1)}\beta!}{\left((t-t_1)/4\right)^\beta}\,\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&\leq \frac{Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\beta!}{\left(\eta(t_2-t_1)/80\right)^\beta}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\\
&= \frac{M\beta!}{(2\rho L)^\beta}\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.34}
$$

with

$$
M=Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ and } \rho=\frac{\eta}{16\,(10-\eta)}\,.
$$

From (4.34), Lemma 13 with $F=E\cap(\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{t}_2)$ and observing that

$$
\frac{15\eta}{2\,(10-\eta)}\leq\frac{|F|}{L}\leq\frac{5\,(4-\eta)}{2\,(10-\eta)},
$$

we find that for each x in $\triangle_{2R}(x_0)$

$$
\|v(x,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\tau,\tilde{\tau})}\leq\left(\fint_{E\cap(\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{t}_2)}|v(x,t)|\,dt\right)^\gamma\left(Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)^{1-\gamma},
\tag{4.35}
$$

with $N=N(\Omega,R,\eta)$ and $\gamma=\gamma(\eta)$ in $(0,1)$. Thus, it follows from (4.33) and (4.35) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|v\|_{L^1(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))}\\
&\leq\int_{\triangle_R(x_0)}\left(\int_{E\cap(\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{t}_2)}|v(x,t)|\,dt\right)^\gamma d\sigma\left(Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\,\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)^{1-\gamma}\\
&\leq\left(\int_{E\cap(\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{t}_2)}\int_{\triangle_R(x_0)}|v(x,t)|\,d\sigma dt\right)^\gamma Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\gamma},
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.36}
$$

with N and γ as above. In the second inequality in (4.36) we used Hölder's inequality.

Next, from (4.29) with $\beta=0$ and $s=t_1$, we have that for $t\in(\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{t}_2)$,

$$
t-t_1\geq\tilde{t}_1-t_1=\tfrac{\eta}{8}\,(t_2-t_1)
$$

and

$$
\|\partial_x^\alpha v(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\triangle_{2R}(x_0))}\leq\frac{Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}|\alpha|!}{(R\rho)^{|\alpha|}}\,\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)},
$$

when $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}^n$ and with $N=N(\Omega,R,\eta)$. Also, $|\mathcal{J}_t|\geq|\mathcal{J}|/\left(2T\right)$, when $t\in E$. By the obvious generalization of Theorem 4 to real-analytic hypersurfaces, there are $N=N\left(\Omega,R,\eta,|\mathcal{J}|/\left(T|\triangle_R(x_0)|\right)\right)$ and $\vartheta=\vartheta\left(\Omega,|\mathcal{J}|/\left(T|\triangle_R(x_0)|\right)\right)\in(0,1)$ such that

$$
\int_{\triangle_R(x_0)}|v(x,t)|\,d\sigma\leq\left(\int_{\mathcal{J}_t}|v(x,t)|\,d\sigma\right)^\vartheta\left(Ne^{N/(t_2-t_1)}\|e^{t_1\Delta}f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)^{1-\vartheta},
\tag{4.37}
$$

when $t \in E \cap (\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2)$. Both (4.36) and (4.37), together with Hölder's inequality, imply that

$$\|v\|_{L^1(\triangle_R(x_0)\times(\tau,\tilde{\tau}))} \leq \left(N e^{N/(t_2-t_1)} \int_{E\cap(\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{t}_2)} \int_{\mathfrak{J}_t} |v(x,t)|\, d\sigma dt \right)^{\vartheta\gamma} \|e^{t_1\Delta} f\|^{1-\vartheta\gamma}_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

This, along with (4.32) and the definition of v leads to the first estimate in this theorem.

The second estimate in the theorem can be proved with the method we used in the proof of the second part of Theorem 7. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2. Let E and $\mathfrak{J}_t$ be the sets associated to $\mathfrak{J}$ in Lemma 14 and l be a density point in E. For $z > 1$ to be fixed later, $\{l_m\}$ denotes the sequence associated to l and z in Lemma 2. Because of (2.16) and from Theorem 11 with $\eta = 1/3$, $t_1 = l_{m+1}$ and $t_2 = l_m$, with $m \geq 1$, there are $N = N(\Omega, R, |\mathfrak{J}|/\left(T|\triangle_R(q_0)|\right)) > 0$ and $\theta = \theta(\Omega, R, |\mathfrak{J}|/\left(T|\triangle_R(q_0)|\right))$, with $\theta \in (0,1)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{l_m - l_{m+1}}} \|e^{l_m\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - e^{-\frac{N+1-\theta}{q(l_m-l_{m+1})}} \|e^{l_{m+1}\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq N \int_{l_{m+1}}^{l_m} \chi_E(s) \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{s\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\mathfrak{J}_s)}\, ds, \ \text{ when } \ q \geq \frac{N+1-\theta}{N+1} \ \text{ and } \ m \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$z = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{N+1}{N+1-\theta}\right).$$

Then, we can use the same arguments as those in the proof of Theorem 1 to verify Theorem 2. $\square$

Remark 10. *The proof of Theorem 2 also implies the following observability estimate:*

$$\sup_{m\geq 0} \sup_{l_{m+1}\leq t\leq l_m} e^{-z^{m+1}A} \|e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq N \int_{\mathfrak{J}\cap(\partial\Omega\times[l,l_1])} \left|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f(x)\right| d\sigma dt,$$

for f in $L^2(\Omega)$, with $A = 2(N+1-\theta)^2/[\theta(l_1-l)]$ and with z, N and θ as given along the proof of Theorem 2. Here, $l_0 = T$.

Remark 11. *(i) In Theorem 2, one may relax more the hypothesis on Ω and to allow $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ to be piece piecewise analytic or simply to require that*

$$|\{q \in \triangle_{4R}(q_0) : \triangle_{4r}(q) \text{ is not real-analytic for some } r \leq R\}| = 0.$$

(ii) In particular, Theorem 2 holds when Ω is a Lipschitz polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathfrak{J}$ is a measurable subset with positive surface measure on $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$. For if Ω is a Lipschitz polyhedron, Theorem 8 shows that Ω verifies the condition (1.4). Also, $\mathfrak{J}$ must have a boundary density point (q,τ), $q \in \partial\Omega$, $\tau \in (0,T)$, with q in the interior of one the open flat faces of $\partial\Omega$. Thus, we can find $R > 0$ such that

$$\frac{|\triangle_R(q) \times (\tau - R, \tau + R) \cap \mathfrak{J}|}{|\triangle_R(q) \times (\tau - R, \tau + R)|} \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

with $\triangle_{4R}(q)$ contained in a flat faces of $\partial\Omega$. Then, replace the original set $\mathfrak{J}$ by $\triangle_R(q) \times (\tau - R, \tau + R) \cap \mathfrak{J} \subset \triangle_R(q) \times (0,T)$, set $q_0 = q$ and apply Theorem 2 as stated. (iii) Theorem 2 improves the work in [35].

Remark 12. *When* $\mathcal{J} = \Gamma \times (0, T)$, $\Gamma \subset \triangle_R(q_0)$ *is a measurable set, one may take* $l = T/2$, $l_1 = T$, $z = 2$ *and the constant* B *in Theorem 2 becomes*

$$B = A(\Omega, R, |\Gamma|/|\triangle_R(q_0)|)/T.$$

Remark 13. *Theorem 10 also implies the following: if* Ω *is only a bounded Lipschitz domain and verifies the condition* (1.4)*, the heat equation is null controllable with* $L^\infty(\Gamma \times (0, T))$ *controls, when* Γ *is an open subset of* $\partial\Omega$*. This seems to be a new result and we give its proof in the Appendix in section 6.*

5. Applications

Throughout this section, we assume that $T > 0$, Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain verifying the condition (1.4) and we show several applications of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 to some control problems for the heat equation.

First of all, we will show that Theorems 1 and 2 imply the null controllability with controls restricted over measurable subsets in $\Omega \times (0, T)$ and $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a measurable subset with positive measure in $B_R(x_0) \times (0, T)$ with $B_{4R}(x_0) \subset \Omega$. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a measurable subset with positive surface measure in $\triangle_R(q_0) \times (0, T)$, where $q_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $R \in (0, 1]$ and $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ is real-analytic. Consider the following controlled heat equations:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = \chi_{\mathcal{D}} v, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T], \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T], \\ u(0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T], \\ u = g\,\chi_{\mathcal{J}}, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T], \\ u(0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

where $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, $v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$ and $g \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega \times (0, T))$ are controls. *We say that u is the solution to Equation* (5.2) *if* $v \equiv u - e^{t\Delta} u_0$ *is the unique solution defined in* [14, Theorem 3.2] *(See also* [4, Theorems 8.1 and 8.3]*) to*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v - \Delta v = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ v = g\chi_{\mathcal{J}}, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ v(0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with g *in* $L^p(\partial\Omega \times (0, T))$ *for some* $2 \le p \le \infty$. From now on, we always denote by $u(\cdot\,; u_0, v)$ and $u(\cdot\,; u_0, g)$ the solutions of Equations (5.1) and (5.2) corresponding to v and g respectively.

Corollary 1. *For each* $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$*, there are bounded control functions* v *and* g *with*

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T))} \le C_1 \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega \times (0,T))} \le C_2 \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

such that $u(T; u_0, v) = 0$ *and* $u(T; u_0, g) = 0$*. Here* $C_1 = C(\Omega, T, R, \mathcal{D})$ *and* $C_2 = C(\Omega, T, R, \mathcal{J})$*.*

Proof. We only prove the boundary controllability. Let E be the measurable set associated to $\mathcal{J}$ in Lemma 14. Write

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{J}} = \{(x, t) : (x, T - t) \in \mathcal{J}\} \text{ and } \widetilde{E} = \{t : T - t \in E\}.$$

Let $l > 0$ be a density point of $\widetilde{E}$ (Hence, $T - l$ is a density point of E). We choose z, l_1 and the sequence $\{l_m\}$ as in the proof of Theorem 2 but with $\mathcal{J}$ and E accordingly replaced by $\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\widetilde{E}$. It is clear that

$$0 < l < \cdots < l_{m+1} < l_m \cdots < l_1 < l_0 = T, \ \lim_{m\to+\infty} l_m = l.$$

We set

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J} \cap (\partial\Omega \times [T - l_1, T - l]) \subset \mathcal{J}.$$

It is clear that $|\mathcal{M}| > 0$. The proof of Theorem 2, the change of variables $t = T - \tau$ and Remark 10 show that the observability inequality

$$\|\varphi(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le e^B \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}(p,t)|\, d\sigma dt, \tag{5.3}$$

holds, when φ is the unique solution in $L^\infty([0,T], L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2([0,T], H_0^1(\Omega))$ to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\varphi + \Delta\varphi = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times [0,T), \\ \varphi = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T), \\ \varphi(T) = \varphi_T, & \text{in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

for some φ_T in $L^2(\Omega)$. Set

$$X = \{\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}|_{\mathcal{M}} : \varphi(t) = e^{(T-t)\Delta}\varphi_T, \text{ for } 0 \le t \le T, \text{ for some } \varphi_T \in L^2(\Omega)\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{M} \subset \partial\Omega \times [T - l_1, T - l]$, X is a subspace of $L^1(\mathcal{M})$ (See (6.4) and (6.5)) and from (5.3), the linear mapping $\Lambda : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by

$$\Lambda(\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}|_{\mathcal{M}}) = (u_0, \varphi(0)),$$

verifies

$$\left|\Lambda(\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}|_{\mathcal{M}})\right| \le e^B \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}(p,t)|\, d\sigma dt, \text{ when } \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}|_{\mathcal{M}} \in X.$$

From the Hahn-Banach theorem, there is a linear extension $T : L^1(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of Λ, with

$$T(\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}|_{\mathcal{M}}) = (u_0, \varphi(0)), \text{ when } \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}|_{\mathcal{M}} \in X,$$
$$|T(f)| \le e^B \|u_0\| \|f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{M})}, \text{ for all } f \in L^1(\mathcal{M}).$$

Thus, T is in $L^1(\mathcal{M})^* = L^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and there is g in $L^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ verifying

$$T(f) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} fg\, d\sigma dt, \text{ for all } f \in L^1(\mathcal{M}) \text{ and } \|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{M})} \le e^B \|u_0\|.$$

We extend g over $\partial\Omega \times (0,T)$ by setting it to be zero outside $\mathcal{M}$ and denote the extended function by g again. Then it holds that $u(T; u_0, g) = 0$ provided that we know that

$$\int_\Omega u(T; u_0, g)\varphi_T\, dx = \int_\Omega u_0\varphi(0)\, dx - \int_{\mathcal{M}} g\, \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}\, d\sigma dt, \text{ for all } \varphi_T \in L^2(\Omega). \tag{5.5}$$

To prove (5.5), we first use the unique solvability for the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T], \\ u = \gamma, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T], \\ u(0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with lateral Dirichlet data γ in $L^p(\partial\Omega \times (0,T))$, $2 \le p \le \infty$, stablished in [14, Theorem 3.2] (See also [4, Theorems 8.1 and 8.3]). Then, because $g\chi_{\mathcal{M}}$ is bounded and supported in $\partial\Omega\times[T-l_1,T-l]\subset\partial\Omega\times(2\eta,T-2\eta)$ for some $\eta>0$, the calculations leading to (5.5) can be justified via the regularization of $g\chi_{\mathcal{M}}$ and the approximation of Ω by smooth domains $\{\Omega_j; j\geq 1\}$ as in [4, Lemma 2.2]. For the sake of the completeness we provide the detailed proof of this identity in an Appendix in section 6. $\square$

Now we apply Theorems 1 and 2 to get the bang-bang property for the minimal time control problems usually called the first type of time optimal control problems. They are stated as follows: Let ω be a measurable subset with positive measure in $B_R(x_0)$, $B_{4R}(x_0)\subset\Omega$. Suppose that $\triangle_{4R}(q_0)$ is real-analytic for some $q_0\in\partial\Omega$ and $R\in(0,1]$ and let Γ be a measurable subset with positive surface measure of $\triangle_R(x_0)$. For each $M>0$, define the following control constraint set:

$$\mathcal{U}_M^1=\{v \text{ measurable on } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+ :\ |v(x,t)|\leq M \text{ for a.e. } (x,t)\in\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+\}.$$

$$\mathcal{U}_M^2=\{g \text{ measurable on } \partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+ :\ |g(x,t)|\leq M \text{ for a.e. } (x,t)\in\partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+\}.$$

Let $u_0\in L^2(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}$. Consider the minimal time control problems:

$$(TP)_M^1 :\ T_M^1\equiv\min_{v\in\mathcal{U}_M^1}\left\{t>0 :\ e^{t\Delta}u_0+\int_0^t e^{(t-s)\Delta}(\chi_\omega v)\,ds=0\right\}$$

and

$$(TP)_M^2 :\ T_M^2\equiv\min_{g\in\mathcal{U}_M^2}\left\{t>0 :\ u(x,t;g)=0 \text{ for a.e. } x\in\Omega\right\},$$

where $u(\cdot,\cdot;g)$ is the solution to

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u-\Delta u=0, & \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+,\\ u=g\chi_\Gamma, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+,\\ u(0)=u_0, & \text{in } \Omega.\end{cases}\tag{5.6}$$

Any solution of $(TP)_M^i$, $i=1,2$, is called a minimal time control to this problem. According to Theorem 1 and Theorem 3.3 in [40], problem $(TP)_M^1$ has solutions. By Theorem 2, using the same arguments as those in the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [40], we can verify that there is $g\in\mathcal{U}_M^2$ such that for some $t>0$, $u(x,t;g)=0$ for a.e. $x\in\Omega$.

Lemma 15. *Problem $(TP)_M^2$ has solutions.*

Proof. Let $\{t_n\}_{n\geq1}$, with $t_n\searrow T_M^2$, and $g_n\in\mathcal{U}_M^2$ be such that $u(x,t_n;g_n)=0$ over Ω. Hence, on a subsequence,

$$g_n\longrightarrow g^* \text{ weakly star in } L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times(0,t_1)).\tag{5.7}$$

It suffices to show that

$$u_n(x,t_n)\equiv u(x,t_n;g_n)\longrightarrow u^*(x,T_M^2)\equiv u(x,T_M^2;g^*), \text{ for all } x\in\Omega.\tag{5.8}$$

For this purpose, let $G(x,y,t)$ be the Green's function for $\triangle-\partial_t$ in $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$ with zero lateral Dirichlet boundary condition. [14, Theorems 1.3 and 1.4] and [14, p. 643] show that for $g\in\mathcal{U}_M^2$ and $(x,t)\in\Omega\times(0,T)$,

$$u(x,t;g)=e^{t\triangle}u_0-\int_0^t\int_{\partial\Omega}\tfrac{\partial G}{\partial\nu_q}(x,q,t-s)\,\chi_\Gamma(q,s)g(q,s)\,d\sigma_q ds\tag{5.9}$$

and

$$\int_0^T\int_{\partial\Omega}\left|\tfrac{\partial G}{\partial\nu_q}(x,q,\tau)\right|^2 d\sigma_q d\tau<+\infty, \text{ when } x\in\Omega,\ T>0.\tag{5.10}$$

Also, by standard interior parabolic regularity there is $N = N(n, \epsilon)$ with

$$|u(x,t;g) - u(x,s;g)| \leq N|t-s| \left(\|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))} + \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right) \tag{5.11}$$

when $d(x,\partial\Omega) > \sqrt{\epsilon}$ and $t > s \geq \epsilon$. Now, when $x \in \Omega$ with $d(x,\partial\Omega) > \sqrt{\epsilon}$, it holds that

$$|u_n(x,t_n) - u^*(x,T_M^2)| \leq |u_n(x,t_n) - u_n(x,T_M^2)| + |u_n(x,T_M^2) - u^*(x,T_M^2)|.$$

This, along with (5.7), (5.9), (5.10) and (5.11) indicates that (5.8) holds for all $x \in \Omega$ with $d(x,\partial\Omega) > \sqrt{\epsilon}$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, (5.8) follows at once. □

Now, one can use the same methods as those in [44], as well as in Lemma 15, to get the following consequences of Theorems 1 and 2 respectively:

Corollary 2. *Problem $(TP)_M^1$ has the bang-bang property: any minimal time control v satisfies that $|v(x,t)| = M$ for a.e. $(x,t) \in \omega \times (0,T_M^1)$. Consequently, this problem has a unique minimal time control.*

Corollary 3. *The problem $(TP)_M^2$ has the bang-bang property: any minimal time boundary control g satisfies that $|g(x,t)| = M$ for a.e. $(x,t) \in \Gamma \times (0,T_M^2)$. Consequently, this problem has a unique minimal time control.*

Next, we make use of Theorems 1 and 2 to study the bang-bang property for the time optimal control problems where the interest is on retarding the initial time of the action of a control with bounded L^∞-norm. These problems are usually called the second type of time optimal control problems and are stated as follows: Let $T > 0$ and $M > 0$. Write ω and Γ for the sets given in Problems $(TP)_M^1$ and $(TP)_M^2$ respectively. Consider the controlled heat equations:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = \chi_\omega \chi_{(\tau,T)} v, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T], \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T], \\ u(0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T], \\ u = \chi_\Gamma \chi_{(\tau,T)} g, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0,T], \\ u(0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

where $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Write accordingly $u(\cdot\,;\chi_{(\tau,T)}v)$ and $u(\cdot\,;\chi_{(\tau,T)}g)$ for the solutions to equation (5.12) corresponding to $\chi_{(\tau,T)}v$, and to equation (5.13) corresponding to $\chi_{(\tau,T)}g$. Define the following control constraint sets:

$$\mathcal{U}_{M,T}^1 = \{v \text{ measurable on } \Omega \times (0,T) : |v(x,t)| \leq M \text{ for a.e. } (x,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T)\}.$$

$$\mathcal{U}_{M,T}^2 = \{g \text{ measurable on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T) : |g(x,t)| \leq M \text{ for a.e. } (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0,T)\}.$$

Consider the time optimal control problems:

$$(TP)_{M,T}^1 : \ \tau_{M,T}^1 \equiv \sup_{v \in \mathcal{U}_{M,T}^1} \left\{\tau \in [0,T) : \ u(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}v) = 0\right\}$$

and

$$(TP)_{M,T}^2 : \ \tau_{M,T}^2 \equiv \sup_{g \in \mathcal{U}_{M,T}^2} \left\{\tau \in [0,T) : \ u(T;\chi_{(\tau,T)}g) = 0\right\}.$$

Any solution of $(TP)_{T,M}^i$, $i = 1, 2$, is called an optimal control to the corresponding problem.

Now, we can use the same arguments as those in the proof of Theorem 3.4 in [39] to get the following consequences of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 respectively:

Corollary 4. *Any optimal control* v^* *to Problem* $(TP)^1_{M,T}$*, if it exists, satisfies the bang-bang property:* $|v^*(x,t)| = M$ *for a.e.* $(x,t) \in \omega \times (\tau^1_{M,T}, T)$*.*

Corollary 5. *Any optimal control* g^* *to Problem* $(TP)^2_{M,T}$*, if it exists, satisfies the bang-bang property:* $|g^*(x,t)| = M$ *for a.e.* $(x,t) \in \Gamma \times (\tau^2_{M,T}, T)$*.*

Remark 14. *By Theorem 1 (See also Remark 2) and the energy decay property for the heat equation, one can easily prove the following: for a fixed* $M > 0$*, there is* $v \in \mathcal{U}^1_{M,T}$ *such that* $u(T; \chi_{(0,T)}v) = 0$*, when* T *is large enough (such a control* v *is called an admissible control); while for a fixed* $T > 0$*, the same holds when* M *is large enough. The same can be said about Problem* $(TP)^2_{M,T}$ *because of Theorem 2 (See also Remark 12). In the case where Problem* $(TP)^1_{M,T}$ *has admissible controls, one can easily prove the existence of time optimal controls to this problem. In the case when Problem* $(TP)^2_{M,T}$ *has admissible controls, one can make use of the similar method in the proof of Lemma 15 to verify the existence of time optimal controls for this problem.*

Finally, we utilize Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 to study the bang-bang property for the minimal norm control problems, which are stated as follows: Let $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ be the subsets given at the beginning of this section. Let $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Define two control constraint sets as follows:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{D}} = \{v \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0,T)) : u(T; u_0, v) = 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{J}} = \{g \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega \times (0,T)) :\ u(T; u_0, g) = 0\}\,.$$

Consider the minimal norm control problems:

$$(NP)_{\mathcal{D}} : \quad M_{\mathcal{D}} \equiv \min\left\{\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\times(0,T))} :\ \ v \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{D}}\right\}$$

and

$$(NP)_{\mathcal{J}} : \quad M_{\mathcal{J}} \equiv \min\left\{\|g\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))} :\ \ g \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{J}}\right\}.$$

Any solution of $(NP)_{\mathcal{D}}$ (or $(NP)_{\mathcal{J}}$) is called a minimal norm control to this problem. According to Corollary 1, the sets $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{J}}$ are not empty. Since $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is not empty, it follows from the standard arguments that Problem $(NP)_{\mathcal{D}}$ has solutions. Because $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is not empty, by using the similar arguments as those in the proof of Lemma 15, we can justify that Problem $(NP)_{\mathcal{J}}$ has solutions. Now, one can use the same methods as those in [39] to get the following consequences of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 respectively:

Corollary 6. *Problem* $(NP)_{\mathcal{D}}$ *has the bang-bang property: any minimal norm control* v *satisfies that* $|v(x,t)| = M_{\mathcal{D}}$ *for a.e.* $(x,t) \in \mathcal{D}$*. Consequently, this problem has a unique minimal norm control.*

Corollary 7. *The problem* $(NP)_{\mathcal{J}}$ *has the bang-bang property: any minimal norm boundary-control* g *satisfies that* $|g(x,t)| = M_{\mathcal{J}}$ *for a.e.* $(x,t) \in \mathcal{J}$*. Consequently, this problem has a unique minimal norm control.*

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank G. Verchota for showing them that not all the polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^3$ are Lipschitz domains.

6. Appendix

Proof of (5.5). For each $(p,\tau)\in\partial\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$ and fixed $\xi>0$, we define

$$\Gamma(p)=\{x\in\Omega:|x-p|\le(1+\xi)\,d(x,\partial\Omega)\},$$

$$\Gamma(p,\tau)=\{(x,t)\in\Omega\times(0,T):|x-p|+\sqrt{|t-\tau|}\le(1+\xi)\,d(x,\partial\Omega)\}.$$

The later are called respectively elliptic and parabolic non-tangential approach regions from the interior of $\Omega\times(0,T)$ to (p,τ). In particular,

$$\Gamma(p)\times\{\tau\}\subset\Gamma(p,\tau),\ \text{ for all } (p,\tau)\in\partial\Omega\times(0,T).$$

When $u:\Omega\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ or $u:\Omega\times(0,T)\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ (or $\mathbb{R}^n$), define the elliptic and parabolic non-tangential maximal function of u in $\partial\Omega\times(0,T)$ as

$$u^*(p)=\sup_{x\in\Gamma(p)}|u(x)|,\quad u^\sharp(p,\tau)=\sup_{(x,t)\in\Gamma(p,\tau)}|u(x,t)|,\ \text{when } p\in\partial\Omega \text{ and } \tau\in(0,T).$$

Let $\eta>0$ be fixed such that $[T-l_1,T-l]\subset[2\eta,T-2\eta]$, with l and l_1 as defined in Corollary 1. Denote by u the solution to

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u-\Delta u=0, & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T),\\ u=g\chi_{\mathcal{M}}\equiv\gamma, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T),\\ u(0)=u_0, & \text{in } \Omega.\end{cases}$$

(See the beginning of Section 5 for the definition of the solution to this equation.)

Let γ^ε in $C_0^1(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))$ be a regularization of γ in $\partial\Omega\times[0,T]$ such that

$$\|\gamma^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times[0,T])}+\epsilon\,\|\gamma^\varepsilon\|_{C^1(\partial\Omega\times[0,T])}\le\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times[0,T])},$$

$$\operatorname{supp}(\gamma^\varepsilon)\subset\partial\Omega\times[\eta,T-\eta]$$

and let v^ε be the solution to

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t v^\varepsilon-\Delta v^\varepsilon=0, & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T),\\ v^\varepsilon=\gamma^\varepsilon, & \text{on } \partial\Omega\times(0,T),\\ v^\varepsilon(0)=0, & \text{in } \Omega.\end{cases}$$

From [14, Theorem 3.2] and either [4, Theorem 6.1] or [5, Theorem 2.9]

$$\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times[0,T])}+\epsilon\,\|\,(\nabla v^\epsilon)^\sharp\,\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times[0,T])}\le\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times[0,T])},\tag{6.1}$$

and the limits

$$\lim_{\substack{(x,t)\to(p,\tau)\\(x,t)\in\Gamma(p,\tau)}}\nabla v^\epsilon(x,t)=\nabla v^\epsilon(p,\tau)$$

exist and are finite for a.e. (p,τ) in $\partial\Omega\times(0,T)$. Also, $v_\epsilon\in C(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,T])\cap C^\infty(\Omega\times[0,T])$, $v^\varepsilon=0$ for $t\le\eta$, and $v^\varepsilon=0$ on $\partial\Omega\times(T-\eta,T]$. Moreover, the Hölder regularity up to the boundary for bounded solutions to parabolic equations with zero local lateral Dirichlet data, shows that there are positive constants $N=N(m,\varrho,\eta)$ and $\alpha=\alpha(m,\varrho)$, with $\alpha\in(0,1)$, such that

$$|v^\varepsilon(x_1,t_1)-v^\varepsilon(x_2,t_2)|\le N\left[|x_1-x_2|^2+|t_1-t_2|\right]^{\alpha/2}\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega\times[0,T])},\tag{6.2}$$

when $x_1,x_2\in\overline{\Omega}$, $T-\frac{\eta}{2}\le t_1,t_2\le T$ [30, Theorems 6.28 and 6.32].

Let $\varphi(t)=e^{(T-t)\Delta}\varphi_T$, $t\in(0,T)$, where φ_T is in $L^2(\Omega)$. From the regularity of caloric functions [13, Theorem 1.7]

$$\varphi\in C([0,T];L^2(\Omega))\cap C^\infty(\Omega\times[0,T))\cap C(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,T))\tag{6.3}$$

and from [14, Theorems 1.3 and 1.4] or the proof of (6.4) and (6.5) in this appendix, there are $N = N(m, \varrho)$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon(m, \varrho, n) > 0$ such that

$$\|(\nabla\varphi)^*\|_{L^\infty(0,T-\delta;\, L^{2+\epsilon}(\partial\Omega))} \le N e^{1/\delta}\, \|\varphi_T\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{6.4}$$

when $0 < \delta < T$ and the limit

$$\lim_{\substack{x\to p\\ x\in\Gamma(p)}} \nabla\varphi(x,\tau) = \nabla\varphi(p,\tau), \tag{6.5}$$

exists and is finite for a.e. $p \in \partial\Omega$ and for all $\tau \in (0, T)$. Now, let $\Omega_j \subset \overline{\Omega}_{j+1} \subset \Omega$, $j \ge 1$, be a sequence of C^∞-domains approximating Ω as in [4, Lemma 2.2]. Set, $u^\varepsilon = v^\varepsilon + e^{t\Delta}u_0$. By Green's formula,

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\int_{\Omega_j} u^\varepsilon(t)\varphi(t)\,dx = \int_{\partial\Omega_j} \tfrac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial\nu_j}\,\varphi - \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu_j}\,u^\varepsilon\,d\sigma_j.$$

Integrating the above identity over $[\delta, T-\delta]$ for a fixed $\delta \in (0, \frac{\eta}{2})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\Omega_j} u^\varepsilon(T-\delta)\varphi(T-\delta)\,dx - \int_{\Omega_j} u^\varepsilon(\delta)\varphi(\delta)\,dx\\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega_j\times(\delta,T-\delta)} \tfrac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial\nu_j}\,\varphi - \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu_j}\,u^\varepsilon\,d\sigma_j dt.\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Recall that $u^\varepsilon(\delta) = e^{\delta\Delta}u_0$ and let $j \to +\infty$ in (6.6) with ϵ and δ being fixed. Then, (6.1), (6.3), (6.5) and the dominated convergence theorem show that

$$\int_\Omega u^\varepsilon(T-\delta)\varphi(T-\delta)\,dx = \int_\Omega (e^{\delta\Delta}u_0)\varphi(\delta)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega\times(\delta,T-\delta)} \gamma^\varepsilon \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}\,d\sigma dt.$$

Because γ^ε is supported in $[\eta, T-\eta]$, the later is the same as

$$\int_\Omega u^\varepsilon(T-\delta)\varphi(T-\delta)\,dx = \int_\Omega (e^{\delta\Delta}u_0)\varphi(\delta)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega\times(\eta,T-\eta)} \gamma^\varepsilon \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}\,d\sigma dt, \tag{6.7}$$

when $0 < \delta < \eta/8$. Next, from (6.2),

$$u^\varepsilon(T-\delta) = v^\varepsilon(T-\delta) + e^{(T-\delta)\Delta}u_0 = v^\varepsilon(T) + e^{T\Delta}u_0 + O(\delta^{\alpha/2}),$$

uniformly for $x \in \overline{\Omega}$, when $0 < \delta < \eta/8$. Hence, after letting $\delta \to 0$ in (6.7), we get

$$\int_\Omega (v^\varepsilon(T) + e^{T\Delta}u_0)\varphi(T)\,dx = \int_\Omega u_0\varphi(0)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega\times(\eta,T-\eta)} \gamma^\varepsilon \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}\,d\sigma dt.$$

Also, from (6.1) and (6.2), v^ε converges uniformly over $\overline{\Omega}\times[T-\eta/2, T]$ to some continuous function $\widetilde{v}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We claim that $\widetilde{v} = v$. If it is the case, we get after letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the last equality, that

$$\int_\Omega u(T)\varphi(T)\,dx = \int_\Omega u_0\varphi(0)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega\times(\eta,T-\eta)} \gamma \tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}\,d\sigma dt,$$

because $\gamma^\varepsilon(p,\tau) \to \gamma(p,\tau)$ for a.e. $(p,\tau) \in \partial\Omega\times(0,T)$, (6.3) and

$$\operatorname{supp}(\gamma^\varepsilon) \cup \operatorname{supp}(\gamma) \subset \partial\Omega\times[\eta, T-\eta].$$

Recalling that $\gamma = g\chi_{\mathcal{M}}$, we get

$$\int_\Omega u(T)\varphi(T)\,dx = \int_\Omega u_0\varphi(0)\,dx - \int_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)} g\chi_{\mathcal{M}}\,\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}\,d\sigma dt.$$

Hence, (5.5) is proved.

To verify that $\widetilde{v} = v$ over $\overline{\Omega} \times [0,T]$, observe that because $v^\epsilon - v$ is the unique solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ u = \gamma^\epsilon - \gamma, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ u(0) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

whose parabolic non-tangential maximal function is in $L^2(\partial\Omega \times (0,T))$ (See [14, Theorem 3.2]), it holds that

$$\|(v^\varepsilon - v)^\sharp\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))} \le N\|\gamma^\varepsilon - \gamma\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))}. \tag{6.8}$$

For fixed p in $\partial\Omega$, we may assume that $p = (0', 0)$ and that near p,

$$\Omega \cap Z_{m,\varrho} = \{(x', x_n) : \phi(x') < x_n < 2m\varrho,\ |x'| \le \varrho\},$$

with ϕ as in (3.1) and (3.2). Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T \int_{B'_\varrho} \int_{\phi(y')}^{\phi(y')+m\varrho} |F(y', y_n, t)|^2 \, dy' dy_n dt \\ &\le m\varrho \int_0^T \int_{B'_\varrho} F^\sharp(y', y_n, t)^2 \, dy' dt \le m\varrho \int_{\partial\Omega\times(0,T)} F^\sharp(p,t)^2 \, d\sigma dt,\end{aligned}$$

for all functions F. The above estimate, a covering argument and (6.8) show that

$$\|v^\epsilon - v\|_{L^2(\Omega_{m\varrho}\times(0,T))} \le N\|\gamma^\epsilon - \gamma\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))}, \tag{6.9}$$

with $\Omega_\eta = \{x \in \Omega : d(x, \partial\Omega) \le \eta\}$. Recalling that $v^\epsilon = v = 0$ for $t \le \eta$, the local boundedness properties of solutions to parabolic equations [30, Theorem 6.17] show that,

$$|(v^\varepsilon - v)(x,\tau)| \le \left(\fint_{B_{\frac{R}{20}}(x)\times[\tau - \frac{R^2}{20^2}, \tau]} |v^\varepsilon - v|^2 \, dy ds \right)^{1/2},$$

when $x \in \partial\Omega_R$, $0 \le \tau \le T$, and taking $R < \frac{m\varrho}{20}$ above, we find from (6.9) that

$$\|v^\varepsilon - v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega^R\times\{0\}\cup\partial\Omega^R\times[0,T])} \le N_R \,\|\gamma^\varepsilon - \gamma\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))}.$$

By the maximum principle and the above estimate

$$\|v^\varepsilon - v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega^R\times[0,T])} \le N_R \,\|\gamma^\varepsilon - \gamma\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))} \longrightarrow 0, \ \text{ as } \ \varepsilon \to 0,$$

which shows that $\widetilde{v} = v$ in $\overline{\Omega} \times [0,T]$. ☐

Next we give the proof of 6.4) and (6.5). For this purpose, we first need to recall the following known result which follows from [7, Theorem 3, Lemmas 1 and 8] (See also [23, Theorem 5.19]):

Lemma 16. *Let Ω be a Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $p \in \partial\Omega$ and u in $C(\overline{\Omega} \cap B_{2R}(p))$ verify $\Delta u = 0$ in $\Omega \cap B_{2R}(p)$ and $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \cap B_{2R}(p)$. Then, there are $N = N(m, \varrho)$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon(m, \varrho, n)$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, such that*

$$\|(\nabla u)^*\|_{L^{2+\epsilon}(\triangle_R(p))} \le N R^{-1-\frac{n}{2}+\frac{n-1}{2+\epsilon}} \|u\|_{L^2(B_{2R}(p)\cap\Omega)}.$$

Moreover, the limit

$$\nabla u(q) = \lim_{\substack{x\to q \\ x\in\Gamma(q)}} \nabla u(x), \ \textit{exists and is finite for a.e. } q \in \triangle_R(p).$$

Proof of (6.4) and (6.5). A covering of the lateral boundary of $\Omega \times (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and the application of Lemma 16 to the harmonic functions $u_j(x,y) = e^{\sqrt{\lambda_j}\, y} e_j(x)$ with $R = \frac{1}{2}$, $j \geq 1$, show that

$$\| \left(\nabla e_j\right)^* \|_{L^{2+\epsilon}(\partial\Omega)} \leq N e^{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\substack{x \to p \\ x \in \Gamma(p)}} \nabla e_j(x) = \nabla e_j(p), \tag{6.10}$$

exists and is finite for a.e. $p \in \partial\Omega$ and for all $j \geq 1$. Recall that

$$\varphi(t) = e^{(T-t)\triangle} \varphi_T = \sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j (T-t)} \left(\varphi_T, e_j\right) e_j, \ \ t \in [0, T],$$

when φ_T is in $L^2(\Omega)$. Then, for $(p, \tau) \in \partial\Omega \times [0, T - \delta]$, $\delta > 0$ and $x \in \Gamma(p)$ with $t \leq T - \delta$, we have

$$|\nabla \varphi(x,t)| \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta} |(\varphi_T, e_j)| \left(\nabla e_j\right)^* (p).$$

Thus,

$$\left(\nabla \varphi\right)^* (p, \tau) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta} |(\varphi_T, e_j)| \left(\nabla e_j\right)^* (p),$$

and from (6.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\nabla\varphi)^*(\cdot,\tau)\|_{L^{2+\epsilon}(\partial\Omega)} &\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta} |\left(\varphi_T, e_j\right)| \|\|(\nabla e_j)^*\|_{L^{2+\epsilon}(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\leq N \sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta + \sqrt{\lambda_j}} |\left(\varphi_T, e_j\right)| \leq N e^{1/\delta} \sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta/2} |\left(\varphi_T, e_j\right)| \\
&\leq N e^{1/\delta} \Big(\sum_{j \geq 1} |\left(\varphi_T, e_j\right)|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \Big(\sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta} \Big)^{1/2} \\
&= N e^{1/\delta} \|\varphi_T\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \Big(\sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta} \Big)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, integrate (4.2) over Ω to find that

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\lambda_j \delta} \leq (4\pi\delta)^{-\frac{n}{2}} |\Omega|$$

and get (6.4). Next, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\varphi_k = \sum_{j \leq k} e^{-(T-t)\lambda_j} \left(\varphi_T, e_j\right) e_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\{p \in \partial\Omega : \limsup_{\substack{x \to p \\ x \in \Gamma(p)}} \partial_i \varphi(x,t) - \liminf_{\substack{x \to p \\ x \in \Gamma(p)}} \partial_i \varphi(x,t) > \lambda\}| \\
&= |\{p \in \partial\Omega : \limsup_{\substack{x \to p \\ x \in \Gamma(p)}} \left(\partial_i \varphi - \partial_i \varphi_k\right)(x,t) - \liminf_{\substack{x \to p \\ x \in \Gamma(p)}} \left(\partial_i \varphi - \partial_i \varphi_k\right)(x,t) > \lambda\}| \\
&\leq |\{p \in \partial\Omega : \left(\nabla\varphi - \nabla\varphi_k\right)^* (p,t) > \lambda/2\}| \\
&\leq \tfrac{4N^2 e^{2/\delta}}{\lambda^2} \sum_{j > k} \left(\varphi_T, e_j\right)^2, \ \text{when } t \leq T - \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that (6.5) holds letting k tend to infinity. □

Proof of Remark 13. From the estimate in Theorem 10 with $\triangle_R(q) \subset \Gamma$,

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(N e^{\frac{N}{t_2-t_1}} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Gamma\times(t_1,t_2))}\right)^{\theta} \|e^{t_1\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\theta},\ f \in L^2(\Omega)$$

and the telescoping series method, we can get the following L^2-observability inequality:

$$\|e^{L\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{N/L} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Gamma\times(L/2,L))},\ \ L \in (0,T). \tag{6.11}$$

Next, recall the L^p-interpolation inequality,

$$\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Gamma\times(L/2,L))} \le \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\Gamma\times(L/2,L))}^{\frac{\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon)}} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^{2+\varepsilon}(\Gamma\times(L/2,L))}^{\frac{2+\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon)}}, \tag{6.12}$$

and the bound

$$\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^{2+\epsilon}(\Gamma\times(L/2,L))} \le N e^{N/L} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{6.13}$$

which follows from (6.4) with $T = L$ and $\delta = L/2$. Then, from (6.13), (6.12) and (6.11),

$$\begin{aligned}\|e^{L\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\le \left(N e^{N/L} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\Gamma\times(L/2,L))}\right)^{\rho} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\rho} \\ &\le \left(N e^{N/L} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\Gamma\times(0,L))}\right)^{\rho} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\rho}\ ,\end{aligned}$$

with $\rho = \frac{\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon)}$. In particular,

$$\|e^{t_2\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \left(N e^{N/(t_2-t_1)} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\Gamma\times(t_1,t_2))}\right)^{\rho} \|e^{t_1\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-\rho},$$

when $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$, $0 < T \le 1$. Finally, making use of the telescoping series arguments, we get

$$\|e^{T\Delta} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le N e^{N/T} \|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\, e^{t\Delta} f\|_{L^1(\Gamma\times(0,T))},\ f \in L^2(\Omega).$$

This, together with Corollary 1, yields the statement in Remark 13. □

References

[1] V. Adolfsson, L. Escauriaza, C.E. Kenig. *Convex domains and unique continuation at the boundary.* Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **11**, 3 (1995) 513–525.

[2] V. Adolfsson, L. Escauriaza. $C^{1,\alpha}$ *domains and unique continuation at the boundary.* Commun. Pur. Appl. Math. L (1997) 935–969.

[3] J.Apraiz, L. Escauriaza. *Null-Control and Measurable Sets.* ESAIM Contr. Op. Ca. Va. To appear.

[4] R. M. Brown, *The method of layer potentials for the heat equation in Lipschitz cylinders.* Amer. J. Math. **111** (1989), 339-379.

[5] R. M. Brown, *The initial-Neumann problem for the heat equation in Lipschitz cylinders.* Trans. of the Amer. Math. Soc. **130**, 1 (1990), 1–52.

[6] M. di Cristo, L. Rondi, S. Vessella. *Stability properties of an inverse parabolic problem with unknown boundaries.* Ann. Mat. Pur. Appl. **185**, 2 (2005), 223–255.

[7] B. E. J. Dahlberg, *Estimates of harmonic measure.* Arch. Ration. Mech. An **65**, 3 (1977), 275–288.

[8] L. Escauriaza. *Carleman Inequalities and the Heat Operator.* Duke Math. J. **104**, 1 (2000) 113-127.

[9] L. Escauriaza, F.J. Fernández. *Unique Continuation for Parabolic Operators.* Ark. Mat. **41**, 1 (2003) 35-60.

[10] L. Escauriaza, F.J. Fernández, S. Vessella. *Doubling Properties of Caloric Functions.* Appl. Anal. **85**,1-3 (2006) 205–223.

[11] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin, V. Sverǎk. *Backward Uniqueness for Parabolic Operators.* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **169** (2003) 147–157.

[12] L. Escauriaza, L. Vega. *Carleman Inequalities and the Heat Operator II.* Indiana U. Math. J. **50**, 3 (2001) 1149–1169.

[13] E. B. Fabes, N. Garofalo, S. Salsa, *A backward Harnack inequality and Fatou theorem for nonnegative solutions of parabolic equation.* Illinois J. Math. **30** (1986), 536-565.

[14] E. B. Fabes, S. Salsa. *Estimates of caloric measure and the initial-Dirichlet problem for the heat equation in Lipschitz cylinders.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **279** (1983) 635–650.

[15] F. J. Fernández. *Unique Continuation for Parabolic Operators II.* Commun. Part. Diff. Eq. **28**, (2003) 1597–1604.

[16] E. Fernández-Cara, E. Zuazua. *Null and approximate controllability for weakly blowing up semilinear heat equations.* Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis **17**,5 (2000) 583–616.

[17] E. Fernández-Cara, E. Zuazua. *The cost of approximate controllability for heat equations: the linear case.* Advances Diff. Eqs. **5**, 4–6 (2000) 465-514.

[18] A. Fursikov, O.Yu. Imanuvilov. *Controllability of Evolution Equations.* Seoul National University, Korea, Lecture Notes Series **34** (1996).

[19] N. Garofalo, F.H. Lin. *Monotonicity properties of variational integrals, A_p-weights and unique continuation.* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **35**,1-3 (1986) 245–267.

[20] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order.* Springer-Verlag (1983).

[21] J. Hadamard. *Sur les fonctions entières.* Bull. Soc. Math. France **24** 94-6 (1896).

[22] F. John, *Plane Waves and Spherical Means Applied to Partial Differential Equations.* Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York (1955).

[23] C.E. Kenig, J. Pipher, *The Neumann problem for elliptic equations with non-smooth coefficients.* Inven. Math. **113** (1993) 447–509.

[24] C.E. Kenig, W. Wang. *A note on boundary unique continuation for harmonic functions in non-smooth domains.* Potential Analysis **8**, 2 (1998) 143–147.

[25] H. Koch, D.S. Tataru. *Carleman estimates and unique continuation for second order parabolic equations with non smooth coefficients.* Commun. Part. Diff. Eq. **34** (2009) 305–366.

[26] J. Kraál, W. Wendland. *Some examples concerning applicability of the Fredholm-Radon method in potential theory.* Apl. Mat. **31**, 4 (1986) 293–308.

[27] I. Kukavica, K. Nyström. *Unique continuation on the boundary for Dini domains.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **126**, 2 (1998) 441–446.

[28] G. Lebeau, L. Robbiano, *Contrôle exact de l'équation de la chaleur.* Commun. Partial Differ. Eqtn. **20** (1995) 335-356.

[29] G. Lebeau, E. Zuazua. *Null controllability of a system of linear thermoelasticity.* Arch. Ration. Mech. An. **141** (4) (1998) 297–329.
[30] G. M. Lieberman. *Second order parabolic differential equations.* Singapore; World Scientific, 1996.
[31] J.L. Lions.*Optimal Control for Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations.* Springer-Verlar, Berlin, Heildeberg, New York (1971).
[32] Q. Lü. *A lower bound on local energy of partial sum of eigenfunctions for Laplace-Beltrami operators.* ESAIM Contr. Op. Ca. Va. To appear.
[33] E. Malinnikova. *Propagation of smallness for solutions of generalized Cauchy-Riemann systems.* P. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **47** (2004) 191–204.
[34] L. Miller. *A direct Lebeau-Robbiano strategy for the observability of heat-like semigroups.* AIMS **14**, 4 (2010) 1465–1485.
[35] S. Micu, I. Roventa, M. Tucsnak, *Time optimal boundary controls for the heat equation.* To apper in J. Funct. Anal. (2012), DOI: 10.1016/j.jfa.2012.04.009.
[36] C. B. Morrey, *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations.* Springer (1966).
[37] N. S. Nadirashvili, *A generalization of Hadamard's three circles theorem.* Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. **31**, 3 (1976) 30–32.
[38] N. S. Nadirashvili, *Estimation of the solutions of elliptic equations with analytic coefficients which are bounded on some set.* Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. **34**, 2 (1979) 44–48.
[39] K. D. Phung, G. Wang. *An observability estimate for parabolic equations from a measurable set in time and its applications.* J. Eur. Math. Soc. To appear.
[40] K. D. Phung, G. Wang, X. Zhang. *On the existence of time optimal controls for linear evolution equations,* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, 8 (2007), pp. 925-941.
[41] J. Le Rousseau, G. Lebeau, *On Carleman estimates for elliptic and parabolic operators. Applications to unique continuation and control of parabolic equations.* ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., doi:10.1051/cocv/2011168
[42] G.C. Verchota, A.L. Vogel, *A Multidirectional Dirichlet Problem.* J. Geom. Anal. **13**, 3 (2003) 495–520.
[43] S. Vessella, *A continuous dependence result in the analytic continuation problem.* Forum Math. **11**, 6 (1999) 695–703.
[44] G. Wang. *L^∞-Null Controllability for the Heat Equation and its consequences for the time optimal control problem.* SIAM J. Control Optim. **47**, 4 (2008) 1701–1720.
[45] C. Zhang. *An observability estimate for the heat equation from a product of two measurable sets.* Submitted.

(J. Apraiz) Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Escuela Universitaria Politécnica de Donostia-San Sebastián, Plaza de Europa 1, 20018 Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain.
E-mail address: `jone.apraiz@ehu.es`

(L. Escauriaza) Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Dpto. de Matemáticas, Apto. 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain.
E-mail address: `luis.escauriaza@ehu.es`

(G. Wang) Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China
E-mail address: `wanggs62@yeah.net`

(C. Zhang) Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China
E-mail address: `zhangcansx@163.com`